

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

SEPTEMBER 1851.

PART XLV.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

[The following article was in type *before* the recent Aggregate Catholic Meeting in Dublin.]

It is difficult to say in which of the two popular expressions—"the rights of *civil* liberty," or "the rights of *religious* liberty"—is embodied the greatest amount of nonsense and falsehood. As these phrases are perpetually uttered, both by Protestants and by some Catholics, they contain about as much truth and good sense as would be found in a cry for the inalienable right to suicide. That Protestants and men of the world in general should besprinkle their oratory and writings with such tinsel, is hardly to be wondered at. It would be unreasonable to look for consistency from men who believe that the Bible contains some dozen or two of different revelations, from which each reader is to choose for himself his own peculiar way of salvation. What has a Protestant legislator to say for himself before an assembly in which this "right divine" is so vigorously acted upon, that every borough and county has its own "representative" creed as well as its own representative politician,—what, we say, has a Protestant to say for himself in such a Babel as this, unless he perpetually puts forth his determination to uphold "the sacred rights of liberty of conscience?" How could Lord John Russell with any decency persecute the Catholics, unless he protested that he did it in this *sacred* name? And how could he, and the rest of the wealthy men who sit on the Treasury and Opposition benches, continue to make laws for the special benefit of the rich and titled, except by solemnly asserting that it was all done for the furtherance of "the blessings of civil liberty, which are the inalienable birthright of every Briton?"

Let this pass, then, in the case of Protestants and politicians. But how can it be justified in the case of Catholics, who are the children of a Church which has ever avowed the

deepest hostility to the *principle* of "religious liberty," and which never has given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that "civil liberty," as such, is *necessarily* a blessing at all? How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular amongst us! We say "for *deceiving* the Protestant world;" though we are far enough from implying that there is not many a Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of "religious liberty," and is confident that if the tables were turned, and the Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would *in all circumstances* grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. Still, let our Catholic tolerationist be ever so sincere, he is only sincere because he does not take the trouble to look very closely into his own convictions. His great object is to silence Protestants, or to persuade them to let him alone; and as he certainly feels no personal malice against them, and laughs at their creed quite as cordially as he hates it, he persuades himself that he is telling the exact truth when he professes to be an advocate of religious liberty, and declares that no man ought to be coerced on account of his conscientious convictions. The practical result is, that now and then, but *very seldom*, Protestants are blinded, and are ready to clasp their unexpected ally in a fraternal embrace.

They are deceived, we repeat, nevertheless. Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, for an instant, when you see us pouring forth our liberalisms. When you hear a Catholic orator at some public assemblage declaring solemnly that "this is the most humiliating day in his life, when he is called upon to defend once more the glorious principle of religious freedom"—(especially if he says any thing about the Emancipation Act and the "toleration" it *conceded* to Catholics)—be not too simple in your credulity. These are brave words, but they mean nothing; no, nothing more than the promises of a parliamentary candidate to his constituents on the hustings. He is not talking Catholicism, but nonsense and Protestantism; and he will no more act on these notions in different circumstances, than *you* now act on them yourselves in your treatment of him. You ask, if he were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly, he might even hang you. But be assured of one thing: he would never tolerate you for the sake of the "glorious principles of civil and religious liberty." If he tolerated you—and most likely, as a matter of fact, he

would tolerate you—it would be solely out of regard to the interests of the Catholic Church, which he would think to be best served by letting you alone. Probably—indeed very probably—the chief hindrance to his persecution of you would be found in the remonstrances of the Pope for the time being; or perhaps the Jesuits might be your advocates, as thinking it much better to err on the side of leniency than on that of severity; or it might be that some such humble opponent of the cant of toleration as ourselves might appear on the stage and plead for mercy for you. At any rate, be assured that the Catholics who would shew you the *least* amount of tenderness would be those very “liberal” gentlemen who glory in their repudiation of “sectarianism,” who call you their “separated brethren,” and base their own demand for toleration on the principles of civil and religious liberty. You might as well fall at once into the hands of the old Spanish Inquisition, as into those of Whig “loyal” Catholics, if the chances of events should give them the power of tormenting you. In fact, the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition were the work of men who were the very counterpart of the Whig loyal Catholics of modern days.

Let us inquire, however, a little more closely into what is *meant* by this phrase respecting the blessings of civil and religious liberty, as used by Protestants and by Catholics. A very stupid person one day arguing with Dr. Johnson replied to one of the Doctor’s statements, “I don’t understand you, Dr. Johnson.” “Sir,” said the Doctor, “it is my business to find you arguments, not an understanding to comprehend them.” Thus it is a hard task to be obliged to put into intelligible language what is actually *meant* by those who advocate the principles of civil and religious liberty. Let us take civil liberty first. What is civil liberty? Is it a right possessed by every man to do just what he pleases? Does it mean universal suffrage and vote by ballot; or does it mean that, by the laws of nature, ten-pound householders alone have the right to make laws for the rest of their fellow-creatures? Does it include the rights of women, when it guarantees the rights of men? What are the rights of boys and girls, to which they are entitled by the principles of civil liberty? Do these principles give us the privilege of perjury, lying, stealing, of using foul language, of blaspheming and so forth, *ad libitum*? And *where* is civil liberty to be found? Amongst Dorsetshire labourers? In the Kilrush union? In the French courts of justice when an anti-Napoleonic editor is on trial? In Switzerland when a government mob is burning the colleges of the Jesuits? In the cotton-plantations in the United

States? It is to be found *in theory* in the "Utopia" of the Catholic Sir Thomas More, and in the "Republic" of the most Catholic-minded of non-Catholics, the philosopher Plato; but *in fact* it does not exist, and it never did exist, any where.

If by "liberty" is meant the *permission* to do certain things in certain circumstances, an intelligible explanation is affixed to the word. But then the whole notion, that there exists a certain principle of civil liberty to which all men have a kind of right, vanishes into air. "Liberty" then becomes nearly synonymous with "law," and "rights" with "duties,"—a change in expression and idea very much for the better. Every man *has* a right to be governed well; that is, it is the *duty* of every man who possesses authority over his fellow-creatures, to employ that authority to their utmost advantage. This is a Christian doctrine, intelligible enough and practicable enough; but what has this to do with universal *liberty*, or any other such hallucination? There are clearly times when an almost utter abolition of personal liberty is necessary for the happiness of every class in a nation. The sole question that ever comes into practical consideration is the *degree* to which the inhabitants of a state may be allowed each to follow their own inclinations, and enjoy an equality of privileges. Sometimes a monarchical despotism is the best practicable form of government; sometimes a wide oligarchy, like the present British constitution, in which the kingdom is governed by ten-pound householders, a small fraction of the whole population; sometimes universal suffrage and vote by ballot would ensure the best legislation and administration for the entire people; sometimes nobody under twenty-one years old ought to possess any political privilege; sometimes the franchise might begin at eighteen, or be postponed to twenty-five or thirty years of age; sometimes women ought to vote (as in England at present) in parish matters, but not in parliamentary elections; sometimes they might vote in all contests, sometimes in none. In all these arrangements no sensible man ever introduces the notion of *liberty* as an element worth a moment's thought.

It may be urged in reply, that at any rate the *profession* of a love for civil liberty does no harm; that it helps to restrain the tyranny of the powerful; that it leads to practical reforms, and familiarises men's minds with the evils of bad government. We think very much the reverse. *Cant* is always mischievous; if it does nothing else, it makes those who utter it look like either tricksters or visionaries. It takes away people's attention from definite, real grievances, and

their definite, real remedies. One single measure of redress of one single evil suffered by the poor, is worth a quarter of a century's cries in favour of their rights to full personal liberty. When an orator is eloquent on the glorious principles of liberty, he does about as much service to the oppressed, as when he trumpets the praises of the "glorious Reformation," or the "glorious Revolution" of 1688.

But if the mischief done in the name of civil liberty is not a little, far more serious are the consequences of the upholding of *religious* liberty by Catholics. For religious liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very word *liberty*, except in the sense of a permission to do certain definite acts, ought to be banished from the very domain of religion. If it means any thing more than a permission granted to individuals or to the Church to make their own choice in certain indifferent matters, or to retain their opinion on certain points not authoritatively defined, it is neither more nor less than a falsehood. No man has a right to choose his own religion. God never gave us such a permission. It is the one thing above all others that He has *not* given us. He has granted to individuals and to nations a vast latitude of choice in other matters, but neither to individuals or to nations has He conceded the faintest shadow of a choice as to his creed. What! shall a Christian dare to say that God has given us leave to treat Himself as a deceiver? That we are permitted to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God or no, as we like? That the faintest choice is given to any human being as to whether he will obey the Catholic Church or disobey it? Will even a Deist pretend that God has granted us permission to deny his own existence? None but an Atheist *can* uphold the principles of religious liberty. If there were no God, of course every man would have a right to his own fancies as to whether there were a God or no. Who should hinder him from believing that there is a God, though he were mistaken? But short of Atheism, the theory of religious liberty is the most palpable of untruths.

Shall I, therefore, fall in with this abominable delusion, and foster the notion of my fellow-countrymen, that they have a right to deny the truth of God, in the hope that I may throw dust in their eyes, and get them to tolerate my creed as one of the many forms of theological opinion prevalent in these latter days? Shall I foster that damnable doctrine, that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, and Judaism, are not every one of them mortal sins, like murder and adul-

tery? Shall I lend my countenance to this unhappy persuasion of my brother, that he is not flying in the face of Almighty God every day that he remains a Protestant? Shall I hold out hopes to him that I will not meddle with his creed, if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I lead him to think that religion is a matter for private opinion, and tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood? No! Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself, for it is truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled by its absurdity.

The *political* toleration of religious error is, indeed, quite another question. While it is impossible to maintain that every man has a right to his own religious belief, without identifying ourselves with the Atheist, we may lawfully, in certain circumstances, accord the most unlimited political and social toleration to the most audacious of heresies. It is only when Catholics become lax and worldly that they can cease to oppose heresy by argument and persuasion, or forget to labour for the conversion of unbelievers; but it is not so in the case of what is technically called "persecution." A Catholic temporal government would be guided in its treatment of Protestants and other recusants solely by the rules of expediency, adopting precisely that line of conduct which would tend best to their conversion, and to prevent the dissemination of their errors. It would do just what it does in the case of men who claimed a right to deny the rules of numbers or space. If some fanatic were publicly to teach that Euclid's Elements were all false, that twenty shillings do not make a pound; so long as his infatuation remained his own, and he continued to pay his debts, and practically recognise the common rules of pounds, shillings, and pence, so long he would be suffered to go at large. But let his anti-geometrical theories make many converts, and find their way into the brains of naval officers or railway engineers, or let him cheat his neighbours on the hypothesis that fifteen shillings are equivalent to a pound sterling, a very small space of time would elapse before our geometrical heretic found his way to Bedlam, and his own personal pounds, shillings, and pence came to be favoured with the surveillance of the Court of Chancery. Just such would be the case in the treatment of unbelievers by a Catholic state; and just such, though a thousand times more irrational, has been the treatment inflicted by *Protestant* governments on those who chose to select for

themselves a religion different from the state-patronised form of heresy.

That in an immense number of instances the persecution of heretics would be in the highest degree undesirable, there can be little doubt. And as a matter of fact, the amount of toleration at the present moment conceded by many Catholic states to their heretical subjects is far larger than that which is conceded to Catholics by anti-Catholic governments. And the less and less the Church is hampered in her action by connexion with the state, the more ample will be the toleration she affords; for it is one of the most certain truths in history, that the severest persecutions have ever been instigated by the temporal and not by the spiritual power.

Still, an adoption of the *policy* of toleration is far different from an adoption of one of the most barefaced falsehoods of Protestantism. Few things, indeed, have worked the Church more harm in England and Ireland, than the occasional borrowing of the tricks of the age into which we have sometimes permitted ourselves to be deluded. Never are we guilty of a more fatal mistake than when we seek to conciliate Protestants, by assuming their garb, by practising their devices, and by repeating their phrases, with the view of inducing them to imagine that Catholicism is more akin to Protestantism than they have hitherto supposed. To the better class of Protestants, it is nothing less than a frightful scandal to witness any thing like a fraternising with heresy in any shape. If our claims are true, they say to themselves, why do we not assume our rightful position? Why are we so anxious to make the Church wear the garb of the world? Why do we stoop, and bow, and cringe before that enemy whom we are sent to conquer and annihilate? Why are we ashamed of the deeds of our more consistent forefathers, who did only what they were bound to do by the first principles of Catholicism? Why do we put our trust in princes and peers, instead of the promises of God, who has commissioned us to place our feet upon the necks of kings? Why do we waste our energies in working the miserable machinery of conciliation towards that world which hates us, and which will hate us, and which must hate us to the end?

Little, indeed, do some amongst us know what mischief is done, and what scandal is caused, by the sight of a Protestant (perhaps a Socinian) taking part in a meeting for Catholic purposes; by the account of a Catholic dinner at which the health of the Queen is given before that of the Pope; by the employment of heretics in the actual public worship of Almighty God, so that—O melancholy spectacle!—a singer who

believes that Catholics are bowing down before a morsel of bread at the consecration of the Host, the moment the awful miracle is accomplished, takes up the words of the Church, and pretends to offer a prayer of adoration to that which he thinks, if not an idol, at least nothing more than the work of a man's hand like his own.

When, oh, when shall we see the day when we all of us know wherein our true strength lies? When shall we learn that the only possible way of conciliating Protestants is to compel them to see that we are not ashamed of our creed, that we glory in the very things at which they choose to take offence, that we ask not their friendship, that we care not for their misrepresentations, and that we fear not their utmost indignation? When shall we be convinced that this is the line of conduct which the world expects of us, which it knows that we ought to pursue, and which it knows also that we shall pursue if we have any strong faith in our own claims and powers? We are no match for the world at its own weapons. We are clumsy deceivers at the best. We dare not use the world's weapons as skilfully as the world itself uses them, because our conscience makes us scrupulous, while the world knows no scruples in its warfare with the Church. We were not commissioned to fight the world with its own arms; nor are we capable of being on good terms with the world. It must be either the foe or the servant of the Church; *i. e.* it must cease to *be* the world, and become a part of the Church herself. We have only one weapon that will do us good service, and that weapon is *faith*. God has promised us the victory over our enemies, and when we have learnt to put no trust in any power but that of God, He will lift us up, so that one man among us shall chase a thousand: but not till then.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

No. II.—*Communion of Infants and of the Sick. Other uses of the most Holy Sacrament.*

WE have already mentioned that, according to the discipline of the ancient Church, all who were baptised, infants as well as adults, were admitted to a participation in the holy Eucharist. As the passage through the Red Sea introduced the children of Israel to the wilderness, where they were fed with

the miraculous manna, so the waters of baptism introduced the Christian pilgrim to the enjoyment of that true bread which cometh down from heaven, which is provided in the holy Eucharist. As soon as they had been born again by the one sacrament into a new life, they were made partakers of the other sacrament, as the necessary food to support and prolong that life. And for this reason the holy Eucharist was very commonly reserved in the baptisteries as well as at the altar; for they seem to have communicated *immediately* after baptism; the sacrament of Confirmation sometimes intervening, sometimes following. The intimate connexion between these three sacraments, and their relation to one another, is thus explained by St. Augustin. "I have not forgotten," he says in one of his sermons preached at Easter-tide,* "the promise which I made to you who are baptized, that I would explain to you in a sermon the sacrament of the Lord's table, which you now see, and whereof you were made partakers last evening after your baptism. For it is right that you should know what it was which you then received, what it is which you are now again to receive, yea, and which you ought to receive every day of your lives. That bread, then, which you see on the altar, when it has been sanctified by the word of God, becomes the body of Christ; that chalice, or rather that which the chalice contains, when it has been sanctified in the same way by the word of God, becomes the blood of Christ. And if you have received these things worthily, you are yourselves that very thing which you have received; for the Apostle says, 'we, being many, are one bread, one body;' thus explaining to us the sacrament of the Lord's table. For consider, was that bread made of one grain, or were there not many grains of wheat? and before they became bread, they were all separate and distinct; but when they had been bruised and broken, they were brought together by water; for unless the wheat be first ground and sprinkled with water, it cannot come into that form which we call bread. In like manner, you too were first ground, as it were, by the humiliation of fasting and the sacrament of exorcism; then you received the water of baptism, whereby you were sprinkled, that you might come to this form of bread. But bread is not made without fire. What, then, is signified by fire? This fire is chrism; the oil of our fire is the sacrament of the Holy Spirit. This, therefore, is added, like fire after the water; and thus you are made into this bread, that is, the body of Christ. We, being many, are one bread, one body; all that partake of one bread, that is, of the bread of the holy Eucharist."

* Serm. 227, alias de Div. Serm. 83.

The practice of giving communion to little infants appears to have been at first quite universal in the Church; and it was administered to them either from the chalice only, or more rarely, as also sometimes to the very sick,* by means of a small fragment of the Host, moistened either in common water or unconsecrated wine, or even in the sacred blood itself. Among the Greeks and Maronites, the method of communicating infants was always by dipping a spoon into the sacred blood, and putting it into the mouth, that it might be sucked; and this custom is still continued. But in the Latin Church the holy Eucharist is no longer given in any way to children, who are without the use of reason, and therefore unable to discern the Lord's body; not that she thereby condemns, as the Council of Trent expressly declares, the contrary practice of antiquity. Far otherwise, for the Greeks and Maronites,† who have retained it, are still in her communion; but forasmuch as it never was accounted essential to salvation, though the schismatical Greeks would fain represent it to have been otherwise, she has been moved by weighty and probable reasons to change this portion of her discipline, exercising therein that discretionary power which belongs to her, for the glory of God and the wellbeing of his faithful people. It is impossible to fix the precise time when this change was made, as it was not so much the effect of any positive decree as that the ancient custom fell into gradual disuse. It would appear, however, that the practice was finally abandoned about the same time with the withdrawal of the chalice from all communicants, which may not improbably have in some measure contributed to it. Certainly the communion of infants still continued till the end of the eleventh century; but even then it was only partial, and had in some places degenerated into an unmeaning custom of giving them after baptism common wine that had not been consecrated. This senseless shadow of the ancient practice was of course severely condemned by the bishops and theologians of the day; yet something of the kind seems to have lingered on for a considerable period, for we find a Bishop of Paris at the end of the twelfth century obliged to prohibit priests from giving hosts to little children under any pretext, *even hosts that had not been consecrated.*‡

It is worth observing, that it was one of the complaints against the Bohemians§ (who were so clamorous for the use of the chalice), that they persisted in communicating infants and

* Conc. Bayeux. c. 77, apud Labbe. Conc. xiv. p. 1331.

† Van Espen. Jus Eccl. Univ. pars ii. tit. iv. c. 2.

‡ See Mabillon, Præf. in Sæc. iii. Bened.

§ Æneas Sylvius, Ep. 130, c. Boem.

persons of deranged intellect, in spite of the contrary practice of the Western Church and the positive prohibition of the Council of Basle. English Protestants, with that inconsistency by which their whole system is so pre-eminently characterised, imitate the Bohemians in one particular and dissent from them in another; the practice of the ancient Church being much more uniform in favour of that peculiarity which they have rejected, than it is in favour of that which they have retained.

But now, to pass at once from one extremity of life to the other, from the swaddling-clothes of the cradle to those of the grave, let us see what has been the discipline of the Church with reference to administering the holy Eucharist at the hour of death. We have seen her solicitude to provide her children with this heavenly armour as soon as they enter upon that spiritual conflict in which it is so needful; let us next observe how careful she has ever been that they should not be deprived of it in the hour of their latest and severest struggle. Our blessed Lord always specially connected this holy sacrament with the promise of the gift of life and deliverance from death. "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "I am the bread of life, that if any man eat of it he may not die." It is the earnest desire, then, of the Church, that none should ever walk in the midst of the shadow of death until they have first been strengthened by a participation of that table which God has prepared before them. "Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they have comforted me. Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that afflict me." At one time, indeed, only the sacrament of Penance, and not that of holy Communion, was conceded to those who had apostatised from the faith, and then were anxious to be received again into the household of God before they died; and this measure of severity was considered necessary in order that men might have the fear of so terrible a judgment hanging over their heads, to deter them from giving way under the far less dreadful sufferings of temporal persecution. It was thought that men might too easily yield and fall away before the fear of death, if they could look forward to the certain prospect of an entire restoration to the fulness of their privileges, the moment that fear was withdrawn and they expressed sorrow and contrition for their fault.

But this severe discipline was not of long duration. It was ordered in the general Council of Nice that, with the consent of the Bishop, communion might be given to all death-bed penitents who should desire it, provided only that in case of their recovery, they should be restored, not to the number of

the faithful communicants, but only to that grade of penitents to which they before belonged, or at most to those who were permitted to take part in the prayers, but not in the holy Sacrifice : and this may be taken as a true statement of the general practice of the Church in this matter, more particularly when in later times it became necessary to protest against the unchristian severity of the Novatian heretics. And at a later period still, when amid the greater multitudes of Christians, many were found not only weak and unstable, so as in time of persecution to fall away, but even such as voluntarily to give themselves up to the practice of those things which ought not to be named among Christians,—thefts, murders, adulteries, and other crimes which the laws were wont to punish with death,—the Church still did not refuse even to these, if they shewed signs of humble and sincere repentance, the consolation of this life-giving sacrament. In the middle ages, however, not the Church, but the State, and on political, not on religious grounds, denied this merciful indulgence both in France and in Spain,* and probably in other places also : it was argued that a person who was cut off for his crimes from the society of the state to which he had belonged was surely unworthy to be a member of that higher and more holy fellowship of the Christian Church ; moreover, that as he had not yet made public satisfaction for his crimes, he ought not to be treated as though he were on a par with honest unoffending citizens. We need hardly say that these sophistical arguments, confounding civil with religious privileges, were the arguments of statesmen, not of theologians. Clement V. at the Council of Vienne most vehemently denounced and condemned the unchristian and damnable abuse of refusing the holy Eucharist to these unhappy persons ; still it was not until the year 1396 that even liberty of sacramental confession was conceded to them by Charles VI., and at the end of the next century the blessed sacrament of the holy Eucharist was still withheld. Louis XI. of France refused it to the Duke of Luxembourg in the year 1475, and would only permit that he should receive some of the *eulogiæ*, or blest bread, before he died. Forty years afterwards, however, the more merciful rule of the Church was allowed to prevail, with this addition, eminently characteristic of her habitual keen and jealous watchfulness in every thing that concerns the blessed Sacrament, viz. that the extreme penalty of the law should be postponed until the day after that on which the culprit had received the Viaticum, “ that so they might not violate the temple of God, which is holy.”

* Van Espen, *ubi supra*. See also Bellotte de Rit. Eccl. Laudun. pars i. c. 2, ed. Paris, 1662.

But let us not dwell on these saddening recollections; let us rather turn to the more joyful contemplation of Christians who had not so disgraced their profession, and were now approaching the hour of their deliverance out of this troubled world, to go and receive the reward of their labours: these the Church never failed to arm with this heavenly sacrament before they entered upon that last scene of their earthly pilgrimage, which was to seal and confirm the issue of all the rest: they were about to engage in their last struggle with the powers of evil, who would then rage most furiously, knowing that their time was short; and how should they stand in the day of battle, except the Lord were with them? Moreover, as St. Chrysostom says, "if the destroying angel passed over the houses of the Israelites when he saw the blood of the paschal lamb sprinkled upon the door-posts, how much more shall not devils fly from him whom they see to have been fed by the very body and blood of the true Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world? yea, and shall not angels come to carry such an one into Abraham's bosom, since where the body is, there shall the eagles be gathered together?" St. Jerome* says that "he runs great risk who hastens to arrive at the heavenly mansions without this strengthening manna." "A man once told me," says St. Chrysostom, "and one too who had not heard it from another, but had himself been deemed worthy to see and hear what he told, that when men are about to depart from this life, if they have participated in the holy mysteries with a pure conscience, angels come and surround them at the moment of their death, like so many guards, and carry them hence, because of that which they have received."

We are not surprised, therefore, to read in ecclesiastical history of many supernatural interventions of God's providence, in order that his servants might not be deprived of so powerful an assistance in the hour of their greatest need; thus it is related of the holy doctor whose words we have just quoted, that St. John and St. Paul† appeared in a vision and gave him the holy Communion before he breathed his last. We have mentioned already how St. Honoratus was warned in a dream by night to go and visit St. Ambrose, whom he found dying, and anxious to receive the body of his Lord; and Venerable Bede gives us another instance from a monastery in our own country, in which a lad who was lying sick of some grievous epidemic in the year 681, received an admonition from heaven, by the lips of St. Peter and Paul, that he should ask for the Viaticum of the body and blood of his Lord, for that on that very day he would be removed to hea-

* Comm. in S. Matt. lib. ii. c. 15.

† Niceph. Hist. Eccles. xiii. 37.

ven.* It seems also to have been revealed to the penitent Serapion, whose history has been already mentioned from the letter of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, that his life was only prolonged until he should have communicated; for the first words which he uttered after his three days of speechless lethargy were to chide his grandson for *detaining* him so long, and to desire him to fetch the priest with the blessed Sacrament, which as soon as he had received, he died. It was for this reason that the blessed Sacrament was reserved not only in churches, but also in the private houses of the priests and in the infirmaries of religious communities,† that so it might never be wanting when any chanced to need it; and in order that there might be no risk of disappointment through the absence or illness of the priest, it was, as we have seen, for a long time permitted to the inferior clergy, and even to the laity, to carry and to administer it on such occasions. It sometimes happened, however, that the dying man was wholly unable to receive it, or that it was not probable that, if he received it, he would be able to retain it. In the former case it was at one time by no means uncommon to bring the blessed Sacrament at least into his chamber, that he might adore, or even kiss it, and so be strengthened and consoled by its immediate presence, though he could not receive it into himself; while in the latter we read occasionally of priests who, shrinking from exposing the blessed Sacrament to any irreverence, yet unwilling too to distress the suffering petitioner by an open refusal of his request, sometimes offered him an unconsecrated Host, as though it had really been that which he desired, the holy Eucharist. Neither of these practices was such as the Church could sanction; the former, though not in any way blameworthy, was yet judged to have a dangerous tendency in leading some perhaps to rest contented with this use of the blessed Sacrament, instead of making it really their own at that critical moment of their lives; and therefore it was expressly forbidden by St. Pius V., and forty years later by Paul IV. also; St. Charles Borromeo too prohibited it: the blessed Sacrament was never to be taken to the sick, excepting with the intention of giving him communion; but if, when the priest arrived, this was impossible, then after having used certain prayers, it was permitted to give benediction with it in the pyx, or if the sick man very earnestly desired it, the pyx might be opened so as to expose the blessed Sacrament to his view.‡ The other practice (that of substituting an unconsecrated for a consecrated Host in cases

* Hist. Eccles. iv. 14.

Bede, H. E. iv. 24. See also Greg. M. Hom. xl. in Evang.

† Act. Med. Eccles. tom. i. p. 180.

where there was difficulty of swallowing, or reason to apprehend sickness) was never the subject of any distinct prohibition, that not being considered necessary, since it had never at any time been more than the practice of a few indiscreet individuals, acting upon their own judgments; and moreover it had been very commonly detected at the time by a supernatural revelation, so that its object was not attained. In particular, a story is told of Hugo of St. Victor, who died about A.D. 1100, and in whose case this had been attempted, that he sharply rebuked those who were practising the deceit, and bid them go and bring him the very body of Christ, for that the Lord himself would provide against all scandal. They obeyed; and when they returned, he prayed, "O God, may the Son ascend to the Father, and the servant to the Lord who made him;" upon which the Host immediately disappeared, and he himself died.

Another use, or rather abuse, of this holy sacrament was both more common, and, if we may judge from the number of councils in which it was prohibited, was not so easily suppressed; we mean, the practice of burying some portion of it with the dead. That this had crept into the Church at a very early period is clear, from the fact that it is expressly forbidden in a canon of the Third Council of Carthage, which was held before the close of the fourth century; the words of the canon are too distinct to be misunderstood: "we will that the Eucharist shall not be given to the corpses of the dead; for it was said by the Lord, Take, eat; but corpses can neither take nor eat." The same canon was repeated in another Council, held in the end of the sixth century, which at the same time prohibited the giving the kiss of peace to the dead; and again at the end of the seventh century.* Nevertheless, it appears that a portion of the blessed Sacrament was buried with St. Basil, and this too by his own desire; for he had some time before divided a Host which he had consecrated into three parts; and having consumed one, directed that another should be reserved to be given to him at the time of his death; and that the third should be buried with his corpse. Again, we read in the Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great,† that the body of one of the monks of St. Benedict, who died on a day when he had gone out from the monastery without the abbot's blessing, would not rest in its grave, but was found again and again lying on the surface of the ground disinterred, until St. Benedict desired them to lay a portion of the holy Eucharist upon the body, and so to commit it once more to the earth. Indeed, it is said that St. Benedict directed

* See Labbe, Conc. tom. vi. p. 644; tom. vii. p. 1374.

† Dialog. ii. 24.

that all his monks should be buried in this way; and that it was the ordinary mode of burial also among the Greek priests. The latest instance of the practice, if, indeed, it be an instance at all, is to be found in the burial of our own St. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindesfarne, in the end of the seventh century; of whom Venerable Bede testifies that his body was transported to this island, robed in full pontifical robes, with shoes on his feet, ready to go forth and meet his Lord, and with the Host resting on his breast. The word used is *oblata*, the oblations, or offleytes as they were called; and Mabillon* and some others are strongly of opinion that in this instance at least it was an unconsecrated Host, and that it was used for the same reason as the vestments, chalices, and patens, viz. as so many insignia of his office, being the instruments about which he had been engaged during life; and this interpretation is confirmed by the case of St. Otman in the ninth century, with whose body *many* Hosts were buried, doubtless with this signification. Mabillon also desires to shew that, in the instance of the monk which we have mentioned, the blessed Sacrament was only to be laid on the body, as if in token of forgiveness, and then removed, before the body was again committed to the dust; but this seems quite incompatible with the language of St. Gregory; and since it is impossible to deny that the practice we are considering ever really existed, because the language of the decrees of Councils so distinctly prohibits it, these may well be considered to be genuine instances of it, however unwilling we naturally are to connect great and venerable names with the sanction of an erroneous practice.

Then, besides these ordinary uses of the blessed Sacrament, as the spiritual food of infants, of the living, of the dying, and even of the dead, there are a few occasional uses in which It was employed during the middle ages, which deserve mention. The most prominent of these was what may be called its juridical use. At a time when it was so common to leave all doubtful and difficult disputes between man and man to the immediate decision of God, this was one among many methods by which it was done. If a theft or any other secret crime had been committed in a religious house, it was ordered that Mass should be said by the abbot (or superior, whoever he might be), and that all the members should communicate, the priest, as he administered the Host, using these words: "May the body of the Lord prove thee this day." If a priest or bishop were himself the accused party, he was to clear himself of the charge by offering the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. This was done even by the Supreme Pontiff, Gre-

* Act. SS. Bened. Præf. in Sæc. 3, pars i. § 53.

gory VII., in the year 1077, in the presence of the Emperor Henry; although, as a general custom, it had been prohibited and abandoned some time before this. When the holy Pope was about to communicate, he turned to the place where the emperor was kneeling, and said with great solemnity: "I know that I stand suspected in the opinions of some of simony, and of other very grievous crimes: now in order that I may utterly remove every scruple of scandal from every mind by one compendious satisfaction, behold here the body of the Lord, which I am about to receive: may it be made to me to-day for a trial of my innocence, that the Almighty God may, by his own judgment, either absolve me of all suspicion of the crime laid to my charge, if I be really innocent; or, if I be guilty, may strike me with sudden death." He then proposed to the emperor that he too should clear himself in the same manner of the crimes of which he was accused, by taking a portion of the same Host as the Pope himself was to receive; but this the emperor declined. In this instance the deed was voluntary and unexpected, and the form of words was of Gregory's own choice at the moment; where it was required by law, it was usual for those who were to be tried by this ordeal to hear Mass, and to observe abstinence during the three preceding days,* and then on the appointed day to receive the holy Communion, and to swear to their innocence, the priest having first addressed them in the following words:† "I adjure thee, N., by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by the Christianity which you took upon you in baptism, by the holy Trinity, by the holy Gospels, by the holy relics which are in this church and in all the world, and by that holy baptism, whereby the priest regenerated thee, that thou in nowise presumest to take this most sacred body of the Lord, nor dare to approach this holy altar, if thou hast committed this fault, or consented to it, or if thou knowest who did."

In Brittany,‡ Guienne, and some other places, it was sanctioned, if not required, by the French parliaments, that before trying any causes the judges should go to church, and there, the blessed Sacrament in the ciborium being placed upon the altar, all those who were going to plead before them were made to take the accustomed oaths, holding the foot of the ciborium, or at least coming quite close to it and in its immediate presence.

This use of the blessed Sacrament, as a means of increas-

* Martene de Antiq. Eccl. Rit. lib. iii. c. vii.

† Ex leg. Eccl. Æthelstani Reg. Angl.

‡ Traité de l'Exposition du St. Sacrement, par M. J. B. Thiers, liv. v. c. ii. ed. Paris, 1679.

ing the natural solemnity of an oath or an exhortation, was often had recourse to both by Catholics and by heretics on any extraordinary occasions. The arch-heretic Novatus,* when he gave the holy Communion to his deluded followers, did not administer it with the usual form of words, merely saying "The body of Christ," and receiving from them a short and emphatic *Amen* in reply, which was then the practice of the Catholic Church; but he took this opportunity of making them swear by the body and blood of their Lord, that they would never desert his faction, nor return to the communion of Cornelius the Roman Pontiff.

When William, the young and powerful Duke of Aquitaine, who had espoused the side of the Antipope against Pope Innocent II., and was besides guilty of frequent irregularities of life, was present on one occasion where St. Bernard was saying Mass, the Saint came down from the altar to the place where he was, holding the blessed Sacrament over the paten, and addressed him with these words: "We have long used entreaties with you, and you have despised us; other servants of God have joined their prayers to ours, but you have heeded them not: behold now the Son of the Virgin, the Head and Lord of the Church, whom thou persecutest, is come to approach thee; behold the Judge, at whose name every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, in earth, and in hell; behold the just Avenger of all crimes, into whose hands the spirit, whereby thou art now animated, must one day fall,—will you dare to despise *him* also? Will you dare to make as little account of the Master as you have of the servants?"† The history of the duke's after-life is the best evidence we can have of the effects which this startling appeal produced upon his mind and heart. Here, too, is perhaps the proper place to mention that action of the blessed Peter Fourer, recorded by Benedict XIV. in one of his Bulls;‡ namely, that he once carried the blessed Sacrament into a tavern, where he knew that men were assembled blaspheming the name of God; and there, exposing it before them, he preached such stirring words of rebuke and exhortation, as brought them immediately to repentance; but the learned Pontiff immediately adds, that actions such as these are not to be proposed for general imitation; neither, on the other hand, are they to be blamed in themselves, since it is manifest, both from the event and from the extraordinary virtues of those who did them, that they proceeded from a divine inspiration.

* Euseb. H. E. vi. 43.

† Ratisbonne, Histoire de St. Bernard, c. xix.

‡ Bullarium, tom. ix. p. 58.

One of the sacred species in this most holy Sacrament was also sometimes put to another use, which must not be omitted in this list of occasional and extraordinary practices connected with our subject, though it is one whose strangeness by no means commends itself either to our feelings or our reason: we allude to what is told of Pope Theodore I., in the middle of the seventh century, that when he deposed Pyrrhus, the Patriarch of Constantinople,* on account of his Monothelite heresy, both he and all others who signed the deposition, did so with ink into which some drops had been poured from the sacred chalice. The same thing was done also at the Eighth Council of Constantinople, at the deposition of Photius, who had been unjustly and uncanonically intruded into the see of St. Ignatius; and doubtless was done with the intention of adding new solemnity to an already solemn act, and of giving to it the character of a confirmed and irrevocable decree. We read of it again on another and a purely political occasion, where the peace, too, which it professed to ratify was in reality false and pretended; that made between Charles the Bald and Bernard Count of Toulouse, A.D. 854.†

The practice of the early ages of the Church, in sending the blessed Sacrament from one bishop to another, even in countries very distant from one another,‡ as a token of friendship and intercommunion, is much more intelligible, and strikes us at once as natural and appropriate, because it is so pre-eminently a sacrament of love and union; but since there was danger of accident during these long journeys, it soon became more usual to send the *eulogiæ*, or blest bread, instead of the consecrated host. Thus St. Paulinus§ sent the *eulogiæ* to St. Augustin; but Pope Honorius sent the blessed Sacrament itself to St. Berin, Bishop of Dorchester in this country, in the seventh century. It is doubtful whether it was the *eulogiæ* or the body of Christ which was sent to the parochial clergy of Rome, in the fourth century, every week, from the sovereign Pontiff, by the hands of acolytes; the more general opinion is, that it was really the blessed Sacrament itself; but the contrary opinion is supported by the authority of Baronius;|| it is certain that those to whom it was not sent were not permitted to say Mass during the following week; but the rule did not apply to the clergy of the neighbouring villages, or even of the cemeteries outside the walls. Indeed it referred only to the twenty-five titular churches, as it were dioceses, appointed by Marcellus for the administration of baptism and penance to the numerous converts from paganism.

* Bronius, Annales, tom. viii. 388; Rome, 1599. † Thiers, ubi supra, v. c. 12.

‡ Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

§ Ep. xlv. ad Aug.

|| Tom. iii. 103.

It was also very common for bishops and priests to carry the holy Eucharist about with them in a burse hung round their necks, whenever they travelled, whether by land or by sea; and it is said that St. Thomas of Canterbury carried it about with him in this way during the wanderings to which he was subjected by the violent persecution of Henry. This practice was continued by Greek monks,* and by the Maronites, even during the last century, when it was prohibited by Benedict XIV. It was also carried in processions, as at the coronation of the Pope or of the emperor; also before the Pope, and indeed before all Bishops, when they were going to sing Mass. This was continued down to the ninth century, since which time it has been the practice both of the Supreme Pontiff, and of the rest, always to go to the altar of the blessed Sacrament, and there adore It before vesting for High Mass. It was carried before the Archbishop of Benevento during his visitations of his diocese,† down to the time of Paul II. A.D. 1164; also by some of the earlier kings of France, when they were journeying within their own dominions; but especially It always accompanied the Popes when they travelled any distance from their own homes, generally preceding them by a short day's journey. We read of this having been done by the Antipope Benedict XIII. when he went to visit his friends in Spain in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and by Pius II. about fifty years later; by Clement VII. also, when he sailed from Leghorn to Marseilles, in the year 1533, to celebrate the marriage of his relative, Catherine de Medici, with Henry, second son of the French king; and a very detailed account of this practice at a still later period has been given us by Angelo Roccha, who was master of the ceremonies to Pope Clement VIII., and was one of those who accompanied the blessed Sacrament before the Pontiff when he was proceeding to Ferrara to reclaim that dukedom to the Church, in the year 1598. The Pope himself consecrated a host for that purpose the day before in St. Peter's, and a solemn procession of the religious orders and clergy, in which the Pope and Cardinals took a part, accompanied It, and remained on their knees until the vessel in which It was placed was fastened on a white steed, richly caparisoned in red silk, with a bell of silver-gilt hung round his neck, and the steed itself was no longer in sight. The order of procession was this: two chaplains preceded on horseback, bearing silver lanterns, and the sacristan followed on a white mule, with a white wand, and dressed in a mantelletta and mozzetta. A number

* Arcudius de Concord. utr. Eccl. iii. 59.

† Ang. Roccha de SS. &c. Op. tom. i. p. 38.

of other ecclesiastics joined the company, and they repeated the seven penitential psalms, the litanies, the rosary, and other devotions, as they went. Hundreds and thousands of people flocked from the neighbouring villages to adore the blessed Sacrament as It passed, and raised triumphal arches at different points of the road. When they drew near to any town, they were met about a mile outside the walls by a number of military, ecclesiastics, and various confraternities; and at the gates the principal magistrates were always ready, bearing the baldacchino, under which the blessed Sacrament was to pass through the streets, which were strewed with flowers, and the walls hung with tapestry, until they arrived at the cathedral, or the principal church of the place, where It was deposited on the high altar, and watched and adored by different ecclesiastics during the night. But if the Pope desired to enter any town with peculiar pomp, the company which attended the blessed Sacrament awaited his arrival in some church immediately without the walls.

We need scarcely remind our readers that the holy Pontiff Pope Pius VI. (that *peregrinus Apostolicus*, as St. Malachi's prophecy most truly designated him) always travelled, during his long and painful journeyings, with the most holy Eucharist suspended in a small pyx on his own breast, or borne in a similar position by one of his domestic prelates travelling in the same carriage with himself; and that Pope Pius IX. too, in his flight from Rome to Gaeta, armed himself with the same source of divine consolation and strength during that perilous journey.

In the middle ages, it was not unusual to use this august Sacrament as a means of checking or averting evils which seemed to threaten serious mischief of any kind; more especially it was used against fire and tempests. The earliest instance which we have of this belongs to the end of the eleventh century, when the monastery of Castro having been set on fire by lightning, the flames were at length repressed by Gerald the abbot holding up the body of Christ in the direction where they were most raging. The same thing is said to have been done, and done successfully, in the case of a fire which broke out at Auxerre on July 31, 1638; and again at Hale in the Tyrol, in the year 1647; and a French theologian,* writing towards the end of the seventeenth century, complains very bitterly of the preaching of a certain Capuchin at Toulouse, about fifty years before, which, he says, had caused the practice to become much more common. In the middle of the last century, on occasion of a fire in the Piazza Monta-

* Thiers, liv. iii. c. xxi.

nara, in the parish of San Niccolo in Carcere in Rome, the question was minutely examined by the supreme authority, and decided. The circumstances of the case were these:* as soon as the fire, which had broken out originally among some very small and insignificant houses, threatened to spread and devastate the whole neighbourhood, the canons of the church (for it was a collegiate as well as a parochial church) caused the bells to be sounded, that all the people might come together to deprecate God's wrath, and pray for the removal of the scourge. They were soon assembled in great numbers, and recited the rosary, the litany, &c. at the altar of the Blessed Virgin, after which one of the clergy provoked them to tears of repentance by a very eloquent and impassioned discourse; and now the people earnestly besought that he would give them benediction with the most blessed Sacrament, and also that he would bless in the same manner the place where the devouring element was so furious, the progress of which might then perhaps be stayed. Unwilling to disappoint their devotion, he acceded to the request, but not without giving great scandal to some who witnessed what was done; so much so, that the whole matter was brought before the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV., whose decision is given in a brief addressed to the Cardinal Vicar. This brief is marked by the usual careful and diligent research which characterises all the decrees of that Pope, and the substance of his decision was briefly this: that whereas such a use of the blessed Sacrament had never been authoritatively sanctioned in any part of the Church, but had only been the result of individual zeal and inspiration in particular instances; it had, on the other hand, been expressly prohibited under pain of suspension at a synod of the Archbishop of Paris, in the year 1674, and also by the Cardinal di Rohan, in the ritual of the church of Argentina, and apparently for weighty and sufficient reasons; viz. that God has nowhere promised to his people an exemption from this world's ills; that the daily experience which we have of his providence teaches us that He often permits such temporal evils to happen to all; since therefore it may be his will that this fire should increase and do mischief, it was not right that we should, as it were, tempt Him and try his power, by using any but the natural and ordinary means of checking it; for that, if we had recourse to supernatural means, as though we expected a miracle, and those means should fail, we had put a stumbling-block in the way of weaker brethren, and given occasion to the enemy to blaspheme. Without censuring then the devotion which had prompted the use of the blessed Sacra-

* Ben. XIV. Bull. tom. ix. p. 54.

ment in the present instance, it was not to be allowed for the future; only the door of the tabernacle might be opened on such occasions, that the people might be more earnest in their prayers, offered up, as they then would be, in the more immediate presence of God. And this is just what St. Charles Borromeo had ordered in his third provincial council, held about two hundred years before. It was not unnecessary to check the indiscreet zeal of some persons in this matter, since it appears that some had even dared to throw the blessed Sacrament itself into the flames for the purpose of checking them; an abuse which would have seemed absolutely incredible, had it not been set beyond all doubt by a decree of St. Francis of Sales, prohibiting it under pain of excommunication.

In France and Germany,* in the fifteenth and^o sixteenth centuries, and for many ages before, it was common, during tempests and hurricanes of unusual violence, to call the people together to the church, and there in the same way, having taken the sacred pyx out of the tabernacle, to go to the doors and make with it three times the sign of the cross, saying, "Christ conquers, Christ reigns; Christ commands you, O clouds and tempests, that you be dissolved;" not from any idle dream that inanimate things could be adjured to do any thing of themselves, but because they are sometimes employed by evil spirits, who are expressly called "princes of the power of the air," to work harm to the children of men; and these of course may be exorcised, and their power be broken, by the presence of the blessed Sacrament.

An instance of this practice is recorded in the life of St. Thomas of Villanova,† in which even a layman ventured to use the blessed Sacrament for this purpose, in the absence of the clergy. A sudden and terrible tempest of thunder and lightning threatened the village of Mislara in the diocese of Valentia; and some of the inhabitants ran to entreat the curate to present himself at the door of the church with the Cross or the blessed Sacrament, in order that it might please God to avert the threatened danger. The priest not being there, a good old man amongst them clothed himself in a cassock, and covering his hands with a napkin, he proceeded to take the ciborium in which was the blessed Sacrament, and to carry it to the lower end of the church, followed by other peasants, with wax-candles in their hands, to implore the Divine mercy with faith and devotion. When arrived at the church-door, he made the sign of the cross, and gave benediction with the most holy Sacrament; and lo! the storm dispersed without touching their territory. Of course, this act

* Thiers, v. c. xi.

† English Translation, p. 155.

was rash, and contrary to the discipline of the Church, as having been done by a layman; but it shews what was an ordinary practice of the clergy upon such occasions, and that the simple-hearted faith of the people was acceptable in God's sight. The practice, however, was altogether condemned and forbidden even to the clergy themselves about fifty years later, A.D. 1573.

We read also* that in some parts of Germany it was once the custom for the parish priest, somewhere about Whitsuntide, to ride round the fields of his parish, accompanied by many others on horseback, chanting and bearing in a burse round his neck the blessed Sacrament, that it might give an abundant blessing to all the fruits of the coming harvest; and in the same way, during the procession of Corpus Christi, in the Christian *Reductions* (as they were called) of Paraguay, the natives used to place all their maize and other grain at the doors of their houses, that it might obtain a blessing from the holy Eucharist as it passed; an act of faith which who shall presume to censure, since God vouchsafed so signal a reward to those who, in the days of the Apostles, "brought forth their sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that when Peter came, his shadow at the least might overshadow some of them?"

We find occasional instances of the blessed Sacrament having been carried even into the field of battle, that the soldiers might be animated to fight with greater courage in its immediate presence. In the history of our own country† we read of a battle which almost received its name from this circumstance; the Battle of the Standard, as it was called, fought on the 22d of August, A.D. 1138, within two or three miles of North Allerton, between King Stephen and David king of the Scots, or at least between the English and the Scots, for Stephen was not there. The English erected on the field a lofty pole, like the mast of a ship, fastened into a kind of carriage. To this mast they attached the standards of St. Peter, of St. John of Beverley, and of St. Wilfred, the patron saints of York, Beverley, and Ripon; and in the centre of the cross, which surmounted the whole, was the blessed Sacrament enclosed in a silver pyx,‡ to be their leader and their standard-bearer.

Again, in the year 1230, a priest carried the blessed Sacrament into the field of battle to encourage the Christians, who were fighting against the Moors in the kingdom of Valencia;

* *Omn. gent. mores*, Joann. Boem. iii. 15, p. 221, ed. Venice, 1542.

† *Hist. Anglic. Script.* pp. 262, 321; ed. London, 1652.

‡ Christianus Lupus speaks as though it had been in an *ostensorium*, and itself visible to the soldiers; but our own historians clearly imply the contrary; and an *ostensorium* was not then known.

and once more, A.D. 1444, it was carried before the Hungarians, when they were fighting against the Turks; and this too was sanctioned, in like manner, by the presence of high ecclesiastical authorities, the Cardinal Julian being in the company of the king of Hungary.

It is to be observed, however, that all these battles were, in a certain sense, battles undertaken for the defence of religion; the two last, against the Turks and Moors, were manifestly such; and even the Battle of the Standard was not so much the result of a desire to defend the rights of Stephen against those of Maude, as it was an act of determined resistance, on the part of the inhabitants of the northern counties, against men who profaned their churches, burnt their monasteries, and put their wives and children to the sword. Indeed, the English troops had been brought together only by the invitation of Thurstan the Archbishop of York, and were accompanied for the most part by the parish clergy to the appointed place of meeting. There three days were spent in fasting and devotion, and on the fourth they were sent out with the Archbishop's blessing; and even on the field of battle itself the Bishop of Orkney, one of Thurstan's suffragans, pronounced the words of absolution over the whole army before the engagement began; and the Archdeacon, as well as a great number of other clergy, were present, having been occupied for a considerable time in hearing the confessions of the soldiers, and in the performance of their other spiritual duties. We may look upon all these battles, then, as in some sort partaking of the character of a crusade, in which case the presence of the blessed Sacrament strikes us with altogether different feelings from those which we should experience had the same thing been done in battles undertaken from mere worldly motives, such as thirst after revenge, the desire of conquest, political aggrandisement, and the like. In the same way, on other occasions also, when in times past the blessed Sacrament has been used in Catholic countries to add the solemnity of a religious sanction to what appears to be a purely secular or political act, there has always been a true spiritual meaning and a good and praiseworthy purpose involved in the action; as, for instance, when Henry III. in 1588, and Louis XIII. in 1614, accompanied a very magnificent procession of the blessed Sacrament in Paris, before opening their respective parliaments, they did so, as they expressly declared, in order to shew "that they put their only hope of deliverance out of all their troubles and distresses in the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, the Mediator between God and man."*

* Thiers, liv. iii. c. ii.

The task would be quite endless to enumerate *every* use that has ever been made of this most august Sacrament by the devotion of private individuals obeying the natural instinct of their own faith and love, nor do we propose to ourselves to undertake it; but we believe we have now mentioned all the *principal* uses, or at least as many as have once received a certain degree of sanction from the Church, either generally or in any particular age or country, or in the persons of some of her most distinguished saints or rulers, and have afterwards been rejected and condemned, or allowed to fall into desuetude, and so may not now be repeated. A few others will come before us perhaps when we speak of the miracles, either of mercy or of judgment, by which the divine nature of this Sacrament has been so frequently and so signally vindicated; and there are others, again, which are public and general, but which began in later years, and still continue, such as Benediction, the Quarant' Ore, &c. Of these also we will speak, each in its proper place; but first we desire to complete our sketch of all that concerns our subject during the earlier ages of the Church.

Passion, Love, and Rest;

OR,

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY.

(Continued from p. 41.)

CHAPTER XI. — *The two Bridals.*

TERRIFIED at Miss Englefield's cry, I rang the bell violently, thinking that there was something far more serious than a mere fainting fit. Then I rushed to her side, and seeing her look very like a dead person, I dashed out of the room, and called loudly for help. Edith and Helen were with her in a few moments; and before they had time to torment her with all the remedies usual on such occasions, the poor old lady opened her eyes, and very rapidly recovered.

"Is he gone?" she murmured, as soon as her senses were a little restored.

Edith and Helen looked at me for an explanation, as I replied that he must be half a mile distant by this time.

"So goes one of my longest-cherished hopes," sighed Miss Englefield, with a look of intense distress. "My poor, poor

Helen," she continued, "my heart bleeds for you; but it is better that it should have come out before you were married than after."

Helen rung her hands in silent suffering, but said nothing. I soon found that I should be an unwelcome guest, if I prolonged my visit in their present state of mind, and therefore took my leave.

The next morning I was there again, wondering what would be the results of the previous day's events, and full of wild speculations as to the manner in which Helen, as a Catholic educated in the faith from her infancy, would bear her affliction. I was astonished to find her sitting calmly with Edith and Miss Englefield. Her face was pale and rigid, but a faint smile lighted it up for a moment as she shook hands with me. She spoke hardly a word during my visit. Edith I saw was perpetually on the point of bursting into tears; and Miss Englefield was painfully restless and fidgety. Not a word was said on the subject of which the thoughts of us all were full. And so things went on for weeks afterwards. Helen grew thinner every day, and looked ill; but she was calm and self-possessed, though she never smiled, except with that strange melancholy smile which speaks more powerfully of deep-seated sorrow than the most violent outbreaks of distress. Miss Englefield gradually grew reconciled to her disappointment in her favourite Edward Churchill, and seemed to transfer all the affection she had lavished upon him to Helen. As to Edith, she was miserable at the thought of her brother's conduct; though I soon began to suspect, or to hope, that she was cherishing a feeling towards myself which tended wonderfully to soothe her aching heart.

Helen's disinclination for pleasure of every kind threw Edith more and more into my company; and whether or no Miss Englefield suspected what was going on, certainly the old lady did contrive to leave us frequently together to an extent worthy of the most match-making of managers.

As I grew more and more conscious of my attachment to Edith, a new difficulty began to spring up. Perhaps I was needlessly fastidious, but certainly I took it into my head that the knowledge I had obtained of Miss Englefield's original intentions towards Edith in conjunction with her brother, would make it seem as if I were seeking her for the sake of the fortune I had learnt that she would possess. To Edith herself I did not venture to give a hint of my scruples; on the contrary, I persuaded myself that I ought to draw back, if possible, and lessen my attentions to her by degrees. Pretty clumsily I managed it, I have no doubt; and the only result

was, that I made Edith as miserable as myself, until she began to pine and droop in a way that defied all Miss Englefield's questionings and speculations. In short, we managed at length to become as thoroughly uncomfortable and wretched a party as can be conceived. I could not keep away from Winterton; my father was frequently from home, and the solitude of Morley Court, as well as irresistible inclination, made me an almost daily visitor under Miss Englefield's roof.

The only really agreeable person who ever presented himself was Mr. Cumberland the priest. He got on extremely well with the old lady, who enjoyed his good-humour and cheerfulness excessively, and laughed heartily when he now and then bantered me on my sentimental solemnity, and looked at me with a pointed expression which made me blush up to the eyes. Now and then when I was walking with him, or calling at his house, he said some little thing which seemed to be an invitation to me to speak openly on my difficulties; but I kept them to myself, and he was too delicate in feeling to press the matter further.

Thus stood our affairs, when one day, on entering the drawing room at Winterton, I found Miss Englefield in tears, and Helen sitting by her, so flushed and animated that all appearance of illness and suffering was for the moment banished, and earnestly striving to comfort the sorrowing old lady.

"Oh! my dear, my dear!" cried Miss Englefield, "what a *hard* religion yours is! Why can't you be like other people? I can't understand all those enthusiastic notions of yours and Edith's. And Mr. Cumberland too! I am quite surprised at him; I thought *he* was too sensible for it. And you tell me he approves of this new scheme."

"Oh no!" exclaimed Helen, "not that. He only said that he *might* approve of it. He thinks that I *may* have a vocation, and therefore advises me to try; but even so he recommends me to wait a little longer, till—till—"

"Till what?" cried Miss Englefield.

"Till my mind, as he says, has got into a thoroughly healthy condition again, and I have recovered my strength also."

"Well, my dear," retorted Miss Englefield, "that may be all very well, and no doubt it is; but I don't understand these *vocations*, as you call them, at all. How are you to know the will of God? I should like to be told. I'm sure nobody can be better than you are, or more religious, or more dutiful; and why you must needs want to be a nun, I cannot conceive. Here I shall have Edith next wanting to run into a convent, and cut off that beautiful hair of hers. Besides, my dear, you know you'll be made a perfect fright. I've

seen nuns myself in my young days, when I have travelled abroad in Italy, and shocked I was, I assure you, to see what dresses they wore. Why a pretty young girl like you should want to disfigure herself in this way, is beyond *my* power to understand. Well, well! there's no accounting for young ladies' whims, after all. Only I do hope and pray you won't put any of these ideas into Edith's head."

"If I did," cried Helen, with a mischievous look at me, and the first true smile I had seen on her bright countenance for many a day,—“if I did, I suspect you would have one stout ally at least on your side, to persuade her not to listen to me.”

"What does she mean, Mr. Morley?" cried Miss Englefield, with a glance of surprise that made me fancy that she was guiltless of any suspicions of what was going on between Edith and myself.

"Oh, nothing, nothing!" responded Helen, with a look of pretended unconsciousness, while all the while she watched me closely from the corners of her eyes.

"Nothing! nothing!" echoed Miss Englefield; "you're a very strange girl, Helen, I am sure. Why, Mr. Morley, you seem hot and tired; I hope you are not unwell. What's the matter with him, Helen? he's now as pale as a sheet."

"Mr. Cumberland!" cried Miss Englefield's precise old footman, throwing open the door, and introducing a visitor.

I never saw Miss Englefield receive Cumberland so stiffly. He was all smile and liveliness, and I felt positively provoked to see any one looking so perfectly contented in the midst of the troubles of other people. He must have seen how coldly his hostess welcomed him, but he took no notice, and chatted away as usual. Miss Englefield evidently imagined that he was come to speak about Helen's wish to become a nun, for she looked as black as her sweet-tempered countenance could become, when, after a minute's pause, he said:

"Miss Darnley, I met Miss Churchill in the garden, and she asked me to say that she should be very glad if you would join her there."

This looked so like a hint for my departure also, that I rose to go, when Cumberland added:

"Pray don't go, Morley; I am come on purpose to have a little conversation with you and Miss Englefield together."

I looked at him with surprise, and Miss Englefield turned first to him, and then to me, and then again to Cumberland, who looked provokingly mysterious. As soon as Helen was gone, he resumed:

"This is a very foolish young fellow, Miss Englefield,"

said he, laying his hand on my shoulder, while I wondered what was to come next. The old lady seemed almost as much astonished as I was, and exclaimed :

“ Sir ? ”

“ Mr. Basil Morley is a very foolish young fellow, madam,” repeated he ; “ and if it was not for sensible old folks like you and me, would be doing himself some serious mischief, not to mention the harm he would do to another young person in whom I know you take a deep interest.”

“ I don’t know what you mean, sir,” cried Miss Englefield, still totally in the dark.

“ Well ! ” rejoined Cumberland, “ I never should have guessed that you would not understand me. I felt certain that *you* knew it, for *my* eyes have told me the truth long ago. And I should have fancied that Miss Darnley might have suggested —— ”

“ Pray, Mr. Cumberland, do be explicit at once,” cried Miss Englefield, now plainly anticipating that it was Helen’s taking the veil which the priest was come to talk about ; “ if you mean what Miss Darnley has herself told me, the less we say on a very disagreeable subject the better.”

“ A disagreeable subject, my dear madam ! ” repeated Cumberland, looking in his turn somewhat foolish and puzzled ; “ I had hoped that the subject would have been any thing but disagreeable. I am sure if I had thought otherwise, I would not have acceded to Mr. Morley’s request, made only this morning.”

“ Mr. Morley’s request ! ” echoed I, in my turn bewildered ; “ what *do* you mean ? I never made any request of you this morning.”

“ But *your father* did, my good fellow,” retorted Cumberland.

Miss Englefield’s eyes and mouth were now open with astonishment ; and as Cumberland again began to smile, she exclaimed :

“ Mr. Morley ! Helen Darnley ! what in the name of patience have they to do with each other, Mr. Cumberland ? ”

“ Nothing in the world, my dear madam,” replied the priest ; “ I never said a word about Miss Darnley, except that I said I suppose she had told you.”

“ Told me *what*, Mr. Cumberland ? ” cried the old lady, absolutely impatiently.

“ That our young friend here was in love with our other young friend, Miss Edith Churchill.”

“ Is *that* all ? ” cried Miss Englefield, actually jumping from her seat with surprise ; while I exclaimed :

"Miss Englefield! Mr. Cumberland! this is all against *my* wishes. Really, Mr. Cumberland, this is going too far. I assure you, Miss Englefield—that—that—"

As I hesitated, Miss Englefield resumed:

"Well, Mr. Morley, what?"

"I assure you," I repeated, "that I do not—that I never—that I cannot;" and again I was silent.

"That you don't love Edith; is that it, Mr. Morley?" asked she.

"Come, come, my dear Morley," interrupted Cumberland, "don't be agitated or vexed. I assure you it will all be right in five minutes. The fact is, Miss Englefield, that our young friend's father has been letting me into a secret. He has told me (as his son first told him) the history of the mode in which Basil here became acquainted with your intentions respecting Miss Churchill in the disposition of your property. And he has taken it into his head, and has put the same notion into mine, that his son has got hold of some scruples or other about this fortune, which (we presume) you intend to leave to Miss Churchill. Pray pardon my abruptness and boldness in touching on such subjects; as we have the same object in view, I am sure you will pardon me for intruding on you. I would not have done it. but that I have seen for some time that *something* was going wrong among the young people; and that Mr. Morley would not be persuaded by me to undertake the business himself."

"Pray make no apology, Mr. Cumberland," said the good-natured old lady. "If the young folks cannot manage their own affairs for themselves, it is time for us old folks to come in and help them. But pray allow me to ask, before proceeding to business, whether it is a part of the office of the Catholic clergy to make matches among their flocks?"

"Why, not exactly, my dear madam," replied he; "and to tell you the truth, it is the first time I ever was employed in such an affair in my whole life, and unless you agree to the proposition I bring, I hope it may be the last."

"But how is this, sir?" rejoined Miss Englefield: "I thought you Catholics considered that every body ought to be a priest or a nun, and here are you actually arranging a marriage before my eyes. I suppose, then, that Helen Darnley is all in the wrong when she says that you advise her to go into a convent."

"Far from it, my dear madam," rejoined he.

"Then you *do* want Helen to be a nun!" exclaimed Miss Englefield.

"If Almighty God wills it," replied Cumberland, "cer-

tainly I do wish it, but not otherwise. It is simply a question of vocation."

"Vocation!" echoed Miss Englefield; "that's just what Helen says. Ah, well! I can't make it out at all. It was not so when I was young. But I am getting old, and the world, I suppose, is wiser now-a-days; though how a young girl can think she serves God better by cutting off her hair and making herself frightful, I *cannot* understand."

On tenterhooks as I was all through this conversation, I could scarcely keep my countenance at the turn it was taking, and I saw that Cumberland could hardly repress his smiles. To relieve himself, as I thought, he turned to me and said:

"Suppose you leave me and Miss Englefield alone for a few minutes. I am sure we shall soon settle matters quite satisfactorily."

I took the suggestion, and walked into the garden. There I sauntered to and fro, in as pretty a condition of nervousness as youthful lover ever endured. By and by I turned out of the path where I was walking to sit in an arbour near at hand. I was almost seated beneath its shade before I perceived that Edith herself was there before me. She looked pale and miserable. A rapid flush overspread her face as I sat down by her side. Neither of us spoke. At last she began:

"You seem not well this morning, Mr. Morley."

"What *shall* I do?" I said to myself. "Well, it is sure to be all out soon, and I may as well speak for myself."

While I was thus pondering, Edith of course began to wonder at my silence, and repeated her question.

"Quite well, thank you," I replied, "so far as health goes, but not very well in mind."

She evidently misunderstood my meaning, for she turned suddenly round and looked me in the face with an expression of unaffected and sad interest, while she rejoined:

"Not well in mind, Mr. Morley? you frighten me. Surely it cannot be any trouble about religious questions."

"None in the world," I replied, almost smiling at her misinterpretation. "My troubles are about myself and —"

I took her hand in my own as I spoke. In a moment she fathomed all my meaning, and began trembling violently, as she withdrew her hand, and fixed her eyes on the ground.

"Miss Churchill!" I went on. "Edith, whatever may be your feelings, have pity on me, and hear all I have to tell you."

She made no reply, nor gave any sign of a wish to go, though more agitated than before. I was beginning to speak

again, when footsteps were heard near, and in a moment who should stand before us but Cumberland and Miss Englefield?

Cumberland smiled a mischievous smile, as he turned to his companion and said:

"I fear, my dear madam, we are intruders here. After all, perhaps the principals in this affair will have arranged every thing to their satisfaction without our meddling in it. Suppose we leave them, and take a turn through your pleasant shrubberies."

Edith gazed at him, as he spoke, with undisguised amazement; Miss Englefield's face absolutely shone with satisfaction and kindness; I felt as like a simpleton as any young man nearer twenty than thirty years of age can possibly feel; while the priest put on a look of unconscious innocence which has made me laugh many and many a time since at the bare remembrance of it.

"Come, Mr. Cumberland," at last said the old lady, "you don't know much about these things, though I really am infinitely obliged to you for what you have done. Suppose you take the gentleman, while I take the lady, and we will each tell them the results of our conference. Come, Edith, my child, give me your arm. I'm glad *you* are not going to be a nun with poor dear Helen. Come in-doors with me, and hear what I have to say to you. And you, Mr. Morley, be a sensible man, and listen for once to an heretical old lady when she bids you obey your priest in what he has to tell you."

With that she led Edith away, and Cumberland sat down by my side. What he had to tell, every body but myself would naturally have guessed; though I was too much astonished at this singular mode of carrying on a love-affair to be able very accurately to calculate on probabilities. The upshot of his conversation with Miss Englefield was, that he, as my father's representative, and she, as a kind of guardian of Edith, had quietly arranged the preliminaries of a marriage between us. All my doubts as to Edith herself, Cumberland laughed at as absurd. He declared he could trust his own eyes, and that Miss Englefield, when the matter was once suggested to her, had recalled many a look and word of Miss Churchill's, which convinced them both that I should have no difficulties in that quarter. And so, in discussion, and protestations on my part, with thanks to Cumberland for his kindness, and expressions of astonishment at his penetration, together with an abundance of all the incoherent nonsense which might be expected from a person in my situation, we passed an hour. Cumberland then took his leave, and I went into the house. In a few minutes Miss Englefield entered the drawing-room,

with Edith leaning on her arm, pale, and her eyes shewing signs of many tears. The old lady took Edith's hand and placed it in mine; and one glance at Edith's countenance assured me that all was well. What passed during the rest of the day was as little worth recording as any thing that ever took place between persons whose hearts were full.

Of course many days did not elapse before *I* suggested the propriety of fixing some period for the wedding. To my surprise I found an unexpected ally in my wishes to avoid needless delay in Helen Darnley. A singular kind of cheerfulness and animation had now succeeded to Helen's past despondency. From the moment that she had made up her mind to leave the world and enter religion, a new life had sprung up within her heart; and occupied as I was in dreams and realities of another kind, I yet found leisure to observe how strikingly all the energy and vivacity of her character was developed under her new prospects. Her dimmed beauty, indeed, bore the marks of the sufferings she had undergone: her complexion had lost some little measure of its brilliant clearness, the light-hearted merriment which had been wont to shine out in her laugh and smile was exchanged for a more earnest though not less cheerful gaiety; and the jesting with which she now and then alluded to the ravages of *time* (as she declared it to be) in her glossy hair, found confirmation in the occasional mixture of a grey hair where all had been dark and shining. Edith often told me of the increasing length of the time which Helen began to give to her private devotions. She took a great interest in all that related to Edith and myself, but it was clear that *nothing* in this world had now any real attractions for her. She had set her heart upon receiving the habit as a novice in ——— convent on the day of our wedding, and with this object in view she soon joined warmly in my petitions for an early fixing of the time. Edith, however, held firm to a delay of three months, having first stood out for six; and so at length it was arranged.

Brightly and peacefully did those three months flow on; once more agitation became a stranger to my heart. Every thing smiled around and within me. My father and Miss Englefield (who now professedly regarded Edith as her daughter) made the most liberal pecuniary marriage settlements upon us. Edith's father was fully as cordial as we could have anticipated. He confirmed his intentions of leaving Edith nothing in his will, nor would he give her a solitary sixpence during his life; but a handsome gift or two, and a kind letter, testified to the existence of some remains of fatherly affection.

Thus I seemed to possess the fulness of prosperity, both spiritual and temporal. The glories, the depths, and the consolations of Catholicism day by day opened themselves more and more upon my mind. Edith was, as Mr. Cumberland repeatedly said of her, the very model of a devout Catholic; and I really believe that I passed through that most trying time in a person's life, the period between the engagement and the marriage, with as little disturbance to the ordinary course of my religious life as most persons.

At length the wedding-day arrived. We were married very early in the morning, in order to allow us to be present at the ceremony of Helen's clothing as a novice in ——— convent, where we drove direct from the chapel-door, the convent being but a few miles distant. Helen, henceforth to be Sister Agnes, appeared to have regained all the brilliancy of her old beauty. Her composure and cheerfulness were marvellous, and as it was the first time that I had ever been present at such a scene, its effect on my mind was absolutely overpowering. My father, who every day grew less and less of a Protestant, was present; and nothing would satisfy Miss Englefield but that she would be present also. The poor old lady was distressed beyond measure; but she had made up her mind, and she said not an unkind word. When the ceremony was over, the good-natured conversation of some of the nuns, with whom we spent a short time in the convent-parlour, revived her while it puzzled her. Her astonishment at their habit and their general proceedings was passing away, and she was getting on admirably with the superioress, when Helen entered clothed in her novice's habit. She stood a moment or two before Miss Englefield, who gazed at her with bewilderment, evidently hardly recognising her.

"What, don't you know me?" cried Sister Agnes.

It was too much for the old lady's heart. She burst into tears, threw herself on the neck of the young religious, and wept aloud. We all began to shew signs of weeping in sympathy, when Sister Agnes, laughing through her tears, exclaimed:

"Come, this is a sad commencement for the married life of Mr. and Mrs. Basil Morley."

We started at the words; Miss Englefield sighed dismally; and in a few minutes we had taken our leave.

"Well, well, my dears," said Miss Englefield, as we drove from the convent-gate, "yours is a strange religion. They seem very nice ladies though, those friends of Helen's, and I hope they will make her comfortable and happy; but why *do* they cut off her hair?"

ST. PUDENTIANA AND HER ROMAN CHURCH.

THE *titular* churches of Rome are subdivided into episcopal, sacerdotal, and diaconal. The episcopal titular churches are five, and are without the walls of the city. The sacerdotal titular churches are forty-eight in number. Perhaps the most remarkable of these forty-eight churches is the church of St. Pudentiana. An extraordinary degree of interest attaches itself to this church from the fact of its being built on the spot where St. Peter lodged when at Rome, as also from its being one of the most ancient churches in the world. To us, however, and in these days, it is doubly interesting, from the circumstances that the saint to whom it is dedicated was the daughter of an English lady, and that it has been assigned by the holy Father for the cardinalitial title of our much-esteemed Metropolitan.

At the battle fought, A.D. 50, between the Roman invaders and the native British, at Caer-Caradoc in Shropshire, the British chieftian, Caractacus, was worsted. His wife and daughter fell into the hands of the victors. His brothers soon after surrendered, and he himself was betrayed by his step-mother, and delivered in chains to the representative of the Roman emperor. They were taken to the imperial city, and paraded before Claudius the emperor. The arms and the ornaments of the British prince were borne before him; next followed his wife, daughter, and brothers; lastly came Caractacus himself, lost in wonder that men who possessed such palaces at home, should deem it worth their while to fight for the wretched hovels of Britain. Claudius received him graciously, restored him to liberty, and reinstated him into a portion of his territories.

His daughter, however, remained at Rome. Her name was Claudia—a name assumed probably in compliment to the emperor, from whom she received her liberty. Claudia is celebrated for her beauty by Martial (*Epigr.* lib. ix.). She became the wife of the Roman senator Pudens. She and her husband are mentioned by St. Paul in the fourth chapter of his second epistle to Timothy: “Eubulus and *Pudens*, and Linus and *Claudia*, and all the brethren salute thee,” v. 21. This proves that Claudia, the wife of Pudens, was a Christian. That she was a Briton has been already shewn: to which evidence we may add the testimony of Martial:

“Claudia, Rufe, meo nubit peregrina Pudenti.
Claudia cœruleis cum sit Rufina Britannis
Edita.” *Epigr.* iv. 13, vi. 53.

There is more probability in the conjecture that she embraced the Christian faith in Rome, than that she became a Christian in Britain.

The house of the senator Pudens was situated in the valley between the Esquiline and Viminal hills, in the street now called the *Via Urbana*, or *Via di Pudenziana*, on the spot where now stands the church of St. Pudentiana.

Pudens and his wife Claudia had four children, St. Novatus, St. Timothy, St. Praxedes, and St. Pudentiana. It is recorded by a very ancient and credible tradition, that St. Peter was received into his house by the senator Pudens;* that he baptised Pudens and all his family; and that the apostle there laid the foundation of the Roman church. Probably the conversion of Claudia may date from the same event. Upon the spot is still preserved a large portion of the wooden altar upon which St. Peter, during his stay with Pudens, offered up the adorable sacrifice. It is kept in the chapel of St. Peter, under the altar.

The learned Bollandists have compiled the documents that relate the acts of the holy virgins St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedes. When the wicked Nero sought to blot out the name of Christianity, and persecuted the Church of Christ, many martyrs obtained the crown promised by the Lord to those that love Him. SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes waited upon the martyrs, encouraging them to suffer cheerfully; and after their martyrdom collected their blood and relics. In the church of St. Pudentiana is the dry well into which she and her sister collected the relics of about 3000 martyrs; and in the church of St. Praxedes is still kept the sponge that she used to collect the blood of the martyrs. There may be no violence in the conjecture that the pious deeds of these Romano-British virgins paved the way towards the conversion of Britain.

They died as they had lived, and in death they were not separated. Both were buried together in the catacombs on the Salarian road.† In the church of St. Pudentiana is kept and shewn a fragment of the original sepulchral tablet, found in the catacombs belonging to the grave of St. Pudentiana, of which the inscription, conformable in its style and execution to the manner of the early Christians, is not altogether legible,

* This would not be St. Peter's first visit to Rome. He went to Rome first in the year 42, the second year of the reign of Claudius; but at that date Claudia was still in Britain.

† These catacombs are known as the cemetery of "Santa Priscilla," who was the mother of Pudens, to whom the ground formerly belonged. They are about a mile from the city-gate, on the Salarian road.

though the words "*bene merenti Cornelia Pudenziana*," and the age 47, may be read distinctly. Both are now in heaven, where they rest from their labours.

An account of the church that gives its title to an English Cardinal cannot be devoid of interest. The church of St. Pudentiana stands in the Via Urbina, or Via di Pudenziana, a street in the hollow between the Viminal and Esquiline hills, and near St. Mary Major's. It occupies the site of the house of Pudens the senator; although some persons have supposed the site to be not that of the house of Pudens, but of the baths of his son Novatus. Pope St. Pius I., about the year 145, converted the house into an oratory dedicated to St. Pudentiana. We know nothing further of its changes or history till the year 1130, when it was given by Innocent II. to canons regular. Several Pontiffs subsequently repaired the church. The church as it now stands is of the date 1597, when it was restored, *i.e.* nearly built anew, by Cardinal Enrico Caetani at his own expense, under the architect Francesco da Volterra. Portions, however, of the earlier church exist, and consist of a square brick tower, or campanile, annexed to the building, and considerable remains of a large ancient brick building, that forms the substructure of a portion of the church. This old masonry is considered to be of the first century, and may have been part of the house of Pudens.

St. Pius V. transferred the church to the Dominican penitents of St. Mary Major's, and united it to that basilica; the chapter of which officiate in it on the feast-day, May 19, the feast of St. Pudentiana. Sixtus V. gave it to the Bernardines or Cistercians, in 1568; but it now is in the hands of the canonesses of St. Augustine.

The plan of the church consists of a nave with aisles (east and west) and choir. The nave is divided from the aisles by seven ancient columns, of bigio marble, said to have belonged to the house of Pudens. The three first spaces between the pillars, on each side, have been filled up with a brick wall. The roof of the nave is vaulted. Two objects in the nave arrest the attention of every beholder: one is a marble tablet upon a spot in the pavement close to the entrance, with the following Latin inscription, relating to the original dedication of the church by Pius I., and to the remains of the bodies of three thousand martyrs piously collected by St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedes, and buried with their own hands: "*In hac sancta antiquissima ecclesia, T.T.S. Pastoris A. S. Pio Papa dedicata, olim domo S. Pudentis senatoris, et hospitio sanctorum Apostolorum, tria millia beatorum virgi-*

num corpora requiescunt, quæ sanctæ Christi virgines Pudentiana et Praxedes suis manibus sepeliebant." With reference to this inscription it may be well to remark, that it was, in the very early ages, called the church "of the Pastor," in allusion to St. Peter; and from the inscription just quoted it would seem that St. Paul had also resided in it.

The other remarkable object is at the far end of the nave—a dry well, protected by an iron grating three or four feet high, sanctified by having been the receptacle of the blood and of the relics of about 3000 martyrs, collected by St. Pudentiana and her pious sister. Upon the gable wall of the church may be seen two pictures, in fresco, by Reti; and in the one on the left hand of the entrance-door, SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes are represented as engaged in this last office of piety. Over the holy-water vat, to the right, is a painting, also by Reti, of St. Peter baptising Pudens.

The right aisle, or east aisle (for the church faces north and south), contains three side chapels, divided by partition walls, and a fourth at the end of the aisle. The *first*, or south-east chapel, is remarkably plain and simple. The roof is a groined vault, with ornaments of coloured stucco. Over its altar is an angel-guardian, a copy from the original of A. Grammatica. The *second* chapel has the pediment of its altar resting on columns of bianco e nero marble. The altar-piece is a Madonna and Child of an ancient school; but the Birth of the B. V. Mary to the right, and that of the Redeemer to the left, and the other paintings, are by Lazaro Baldi. The *third* chapel has over its altar a St. Bernard, whose pen is guided by the B. Virgin; and the same Saint before the Eternal Father, to the right, and the St. Theresa in ecstasy, to the left, are by M. Cippitelli. The *chapel at the northern end of the nave* is dedicated to St. Pudente. A considerable portion of the pavement outside it is composed of rough mosaic, of small uniform pieces of yellow tile. The picture of St. Peter baptising St. Pudente is by A. Nucci. Underneath the plain altar is a large marble flag that covers the entrance to the crypt below, the cemetery of the nuns. The vestry is at the east side of this chapel.

The left aisle, or west aisle, contains but one side chapel, and one chapel at its north end. The side chapel belongs to the family of the founder of the church, Cardinal Caetani. A great part of the pavement outside is composed of the same rough mosaic already mentioned. At its entrance are four Corinthian columns, incrustated with giallo antico marble. The chapel is square, and the pavement is of inlaid marble. The roof is supported by four arches that form the four sides of

the chapel, and is richly decorated with gilded carving, with mosaics by P. Rossetto, from the cartoons of F. Zuccari. On the wall to the right of the altar is a monument of a Cardinal Caetani, who deceased in 1688; and on the left wall is the monument of the restorer of the church, Cardinal Caetani. Above each of these monuments the scarlet hat of the deceased Cardinal still remains suspended. Both monuments are similar, consisting principally of a sarcophagus of breccia nera e gialla, with a bust of white marble, surmounted by a pediment bearing on its extremities a pair of reclining angels, and supported on a pair of columns of verde antico, with torus and plinth of white marble, on a base of very fine Porta Santa. Each monument is flanked by two marble figures in niches. The first one to the right on entering the chapel is "Fortitude," by a pupil of Guidi; and the second is "Temperance," by A. Lorenese. The first to the left is "Justice," by Carlo Malavista; and the second "Prudence," by F. Mari. The pediment of the altar is supported on a pair of composite columns of a rare lumachella marble, called Pietra Pidocchio, with gilded capitals. The altar-piece is not a painting, but a very fine bas-relief, in white marble, of the nativity of our blessed Saviour.

The chapel of St. Peter is at the north end of the west aisle. Upon the wall to the left of the entrance is the fragment of the monumental slab belonging to the grave of St. Pudentiana, found in the catacombs, and already described. The life of St. Peter is illustrated in frescoes, on its roof, by Baglioni. Under the altar-slab is preserved a most remarkable relic, *i. e.* the wooden altar upon which St. Peter offered the adorable sacrifice whilst he lived in the house of Pudens. An inscription on a tablet of black marble on the right of the altar informs the visitor that "In hoc altare sanctus Petrus, pro vivis et defunctis, ad augendam fidelium multitudinem, corpus et sanguinem Domini offerebat." Above the altar is a bas-relief, in white marble, by G. B. Della Porta, representing St. Peter kneeling to receive the keys from our blessed Saviour.

We may now pass from the description of the nave, with its aisles and side chapels, to speak of the choir or sanctuary. The choir is raised two steps above the nave. Its roof is a flat dome, and the concave of the dome or cupola, as also the spandrels of the four supporting arches, are painted by Pommerancio. At the end of the choir the high altar is contained within an apse. The mosaic, in the apse above the altar, is supposed to be of the early date of the ninth century, and a first-rate specimen of mosaic work of that period.

It represents our Lord enthroned, with a book in his hand, on which is written, "*Dominus Conservator Ecclesiæ Pudentianæ.*" The altar-piece is a picture of St. Pudentiana; and by its side are pictures of St. Novatus and St. Timothy, her brothers, all by Bernardino Nocchi of Lucca.

Two or three memorials of the holy family of Pudens, existing in the church of St. Praxedes, on the Esquiline, near St. Mary Major's, call for a passing notice. The sponge used by St. Praxedes to collect the blood of the martyrs is kept in the tribune, beneath which is a painting of St. Praxedes by D. Muratori. In the middle of the nave, directly opposite the entrance, is the well in which SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes deposited the relics of the martyrs, with their blood, collected by means of sponges. The well is surrounded by a solid marble balustrade three or four feet high, hexagonal in form. It is at present blocked up with an artificial bottom and side lining of marble, to a depth of three or four feet below the pavement. Within the well is a wooden effigy representing St. Praxedes on her knees squeezing a sponge, saturated with the blood of the martyrs, into a basin, in allusion to the practice of herself and sister, who used to collect the bodies of all the Christian martyrs they could find, and mingle the blood of the faithful in the holy well, after consigning their relics to the earth. One of the sides of the balustrade has the following inscription :

" Quem pia Praxedes collegit in urbe cruorem
Fusum a martyribus, fudit in hunc puteum :
Ut quæ patricio fuerat de sanguine clara,
Esset, collecto sanguine, clara magis."

In the left-hand aisle, on the gable wall, there is a rude fresco representing St. Praxedes sleeping on a slab. Underneath it, and fixed to the wall, is a slab of stone, said to have been her bed; to which is added the inscription: "Sopra questo marmo dormiva la santa vergine Prassede."

A crypt or confessional extends twenty yards or more underneath the choir. Ten steps lead down into it, at the bottom of which is the door opening into it. It contains at the end a small plain altar; and at the sides are four stone coffins, upon one of which is a short inscription, stating that the bodies of the Saints Praxedes and Pudentiana repose within.

Such is a brief outline of the history of the family of the Roman senator Pudens, and of the church in the capital of the Christian world dedicated to St. Pudentiana, that gives its title to our English Cardinal. Few churches are held in

higher esteem by the Roman people; none more eagerly resorted to by the British traveller who makes a pilgrimage of devotion to Rome. Had the whole of the forty-eight sacerdotal titular churches been vacant when an English Cardinal was made, the holy Father could not have chosen one more appropriate for him than the title of St. Pudentiana. We feel grateful for this paternal proof of his love towards England in the choice. Who knows but that the conversion of England may be very much accelerated thereby? St. Pudentiana must have always felt an especial interest in the country that gave her mother birth. Now that interest will be, if possible, increased, because her church is presided over by an English Cardinal. St. Peter must have always held this country in affection; and for one reason among a thousand, because he was entertained at Rome by a British matron; and the good daughters of this British lady ministered to the early martyrs, collected their blood, and gave burial to their relics. Could any thing increase this affection, it would be, that the spot where he lodged at Rome, now a church, has become the titular of a Cardinal belonging to the country that gave the hospitable Claudia and her saintly family to Rome. England gave to Pagan Rome the daughter of one of its sturdy chieftains, who became the wife of the first Christian senator, and the mother of four saints; who, not forgetting hospitality, being not aware of it, entertained an angel in the person of the prince of the apostles (Heb. xiii. 2), and who, through the instrumentality of the Apostle, received the grace of conversion and the peace of the Gospel, as Christ had ordered his Apostles. "And into whatsoever city or town you shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till you go thence. And when you come into the house, salute it, saying: Peace be to this house. And if that house be worthy, *your peace shall come upon it*" (Matt. x. 11, &c.). In return, Christian Rome adds one of England's sons to the Sacred College of Cardinals, and in giving him a title from this church, makes it his privilege to be *Conservator Ecclesiæ Pudentianæ*.

Poetry.

GOD WITH US.

BENEATH these airy vaults of carven stone,
 Among the many pillars ranged afar,
 Ever the Presence dwells, calm and alone ;
 Kingly and calm—as a pure distant star
 Looketh serenely from its silent throne,
 And thrills from the abodes where the Immortal are.

No voice, no form ; but as o'er boundless hills
 Sweet universal winds pass on unseen,
 Yet rippling visibly a myriad rills
 And the soft endless solitudes of green ;
 So o'er a thousand hearts and yielding wills
 He breathes, and all are bless'd—none knows how it hath been.

As eyes replete with an enamour'd woe
 Come haunting darkness, and no rest allow
 To one that still remembers ; even so
 The power of deepest looks lies on us now
 From the Unseen, and through the stillness flow
 Murmurs that sweetly tell why once He died and how.

Thou art gone hence, we see Thee now no more !
 Away in far infinity Thou art ;
 But love and power are thine ! We cannot soar
 O'er the dread gulfs that us and Godhead part,
 But Thou walk'st to us on the waves that roar,
 Glid'st vision-like to aid, and liftest the faint heart.

Absence and presence Thou unit'st in one ;
 Thy blessed brow, the rainbow-light that springs
 From the Five Wounds, the lightning-gleams that run
 Obedient round Thee, and the clouds of wings
 Cluster'd like doves around the central sun,
 Ah, these o'erwhelm ; too wondrous dazzling things !

Therefore Thou linger'st 'mongst the feeble race,
 Through mystic twilight all unseen, yet known.
 Thou art away—we pine and pray for grace ;
 Thou art so near—we faint not as alone :
 Too little, for Thou spak'st of face to face,
 Enough—enough to bless and to sustain thine own !

R. M.

Reviews.

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE ON ERASTIANISM.

A Sketch of the History of Erastianism. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire. London, Murray.

THIS little work is on a subject-matter always interesting, but especially so in the actual state of the Anglican communion. The name and high position of the author have induced us to read it carefully, and we shall begin our remarks by letting him set forth his own view in his own words, pointing out afterwards wherein that view is inadequate.

“By Erastianism,” says the author, “I understand that system of opinions, and that course of action, which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into the function of the civil government. It is the more needful to consider the nature of this system, because by many it has been supposed to be involved in an admission of the royal supremacy, since it has often been supposed that the Church of England designed to surrender her liberty to the temporal power, and that the clergy are inconsistent when they assert their independence. But the characteristic features and essential principle of Erastianism can hardly be understood without some knowledge of the circumstances which have led to its prevalence. For this purpose we must go back to those great events which convulsed Europe during the sixteenth century. I propose, then, to consider, first, what principles of Church authority were engendered either here or abroad by the Reformation; secondly, how these principles gave birth to the system of Erastianism; thirdly, what effects have followed from its predominance.”

The author, accordingly, pursues this inquiry in three chapters, in which he respectively sets forth three different systems as to the distribution of Church authority between the spiritual and the temporal power, which he considers to have prevailed successively since the Reformation. The first of these he calls “the Episcopal system;” the second, “the Territorial system, or Erastianism;” the third, “the Consistorial system, or the effects of Erastianism.”

The “Episcopal system,” which he considers to have prevailed for some time in Germany after the Reformation (though so far as regards that country it is surely a misnomer), and in England from 1534 to 1688, “implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king” (p. 41). “The royal co-operation was supposed to confer that com-

pleteness on the national Church, the possession of which made its sentence equivalent to the sentence of the Church universal in its power of binding the consciences of the king's subjects" (p. 46). "It was an alliance between the clergy and the crown, by which each party gained protection against those opposite enemies, the Presbyterians and the Pope. The Church's courts were protected by the royal power; while, on the other hand, the prince's authority was sustained by the co-operation of his native clergy" (p. 25); and more particularly, dividing Church authority into "a question of persons and a question of things;" as to the former, the crown "left the ministration of orders untouched." Whether it arrogated mission to itself, he would seem to leave doubtful; "the question of communion was supposed to be left as formerly to the courts of the Bishops," and "the right of patronage was rested on the fact of ancient endowment" (p. 13), while as to the latter, the author dwells much on the declaration of the twentieth Anglican article, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith;" seems doubtful in what proportions this so-called Church authority was divided between the crown and the clergy, but states that, "impossible as it is to discern how much was to be ascribed to the one, and how much to the other authority, nothing can be clearer than that the two, taken collectively, were supposed to possess a final power in the interpretation of doctrine" (p. 21).

There appears to us considerable indistinctness in this view of things, and one important error as to fact, which we shall hereafter point out; but here our object is to state the author's meaning.

In the second chapter he traces how both in Germany and in England the "Episcopal system" was destined to change into the "Territorial," of which the "principle was that the consent of the clergy was not required for the settlement of questions of doctrine, which must be decided exclusively by the temporal power" (p. 33). This system he considers identical with that of "Thomas Lieber, or Erastus, as he called himself, a physician and professor of Heidelberg, born A.D. 1524," who taught "that the civil magistrate has not only a peculiar commission, as being invested by divine appointment with a place in the Church's administration (which the episcopal system was ready to allow), but that he possesses this power by inherent authority, whether he be a Christian or no; and further, that he is not bound to refer to the Church, as directed by supernatural guidance in the discovery of truth" (p. 36). Omitting the introduction of this system into Germany, we will pass to his review of those "influences which have tended

to introduce that Territorial or Erastian system in England, which the combination of Pietism and Liberalism rendered prevalent in Germany" (p. 41). And here he considers that "two especial causes have been at work, the first in the age of the Tudors and Stuarts, the second in that of their successors: the first, the ancient belief in the divine right of kings; the second, the modern disbelief in the divine right of the Church. It was shewn that the Episcopal system implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king: to exalt the kingly, or to break down the priestly authority, was alike fatal therefore to the ancient theory, because it destroyed the harmony of its parts; so that both tendencies led to an undue exaltation of the temporal power, or to the adoption of Erastianism." This influence, exerted by the notion of the divine right of kings, is traced out very effectively from p. 41 to p. 60, and the progress of disbelief in the divine right of the Church, with its results, from p. 61 to 70.

In the third chapter he treats of the "Consistorial system, or the effects of Erastianism," for "the Episcopal system has given way, both at home and in Germany, to pure Erastianism. It remains to observe the effects of the alteration in either country" (p. 78). And here the progress of things in Germany affords an instructive comment on their course in England. "Now to suppose," says our author, "that man's faith is to be taken blindly from the ruler under whose control he lives; that each sovereign has a right to prescribe such a religion as he pleases, and that his subjects are bound in conscience to accept it, (which is the Territorial system, or Erastianism), all this is so contrary to the first instincts of nature, that it is impossible that men should submit to it without reluctance. Those who receive the teaching of the Church, believe that she has promise of guidance from God's enlightening Spirit; but no such claim is even advanced by the parties who wield the civil sword. On this ground, then, the Territorial system was opposed by Pfaff, the learned chancellor of Tübingen, who describes it as 'that worst pest of the Church, a Cæsaropapacy.' In place of it he introduced what he called 'the Consistorial system;' viz. the theory that 'the prince's interference in Church matters was not derived either from hereditary right, or from territorial supremacy, but from the free concession of the people' (p. 79). "Now this power might be supposed to belong to the body of the people, either by natural right, or by divine institution. The last is the theory of Presbyterianism, which has prevailed in all Protestant countries where the crown did not favour the Reformation, and those who have

adopted it still retain (as in Scotland) their ancient hostility to the royal supremacy." But the other theory, that of the Consistorial system, "asserted Church authority to rest upon the mutual consent of men, when they entered into relations with one another as members of the same nation" (p. 80); and where this is "laid down as supplying the general theory of Church authority, the notion that the Church claims any divine guidance must be abandoned" (p. 82); so that this is identical with Rationalism. So much for Germany.

But now, "to turn to our own country. It may seem extraordinary that a nation so jealous of their liberties as the English should be content to renounce the most precious part of the heritage of men. For it has been shewn in the last chapter that at present it rests with the sovereign to explain finally what is the mind of the Church of England. The royal authority, when exercised in hearing appeals from the ecclesiastical courts, is not concerned with questions of property, but goes directly to the settlement of spiritual matters themselves. How can this be doubted, since it is plainly the Church's duty to correct erroneous teaching; and there is no question of any kind, which can arise in any court of the Church, which is brought for final adjudication to any other tribunal? So that either the Church herself exercises no religious authority, or religious authority is exercised by the prince. For every authority which the one exercises in inferior processes is exercised in the highest instance by the other. The legislature, while vesting in the sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed, lays down with fearful exactness the breadth of that authority with which he is entrusted. * * * But if the civil judge undertakes to decide respecting the spiritual question itself, he usurps functions which belong to another department; so that the independent existence of the spiritual society is virtually denied" (p. 82-4).

But now, "how does it happen that the English people acquiesce so readily in such an interference with the rights of conscience? Because the assertion of the unfettered liberty of individual belief has made many persons indifferent through what means the Church expresses her judgment. If they felt bound in conscience to respect her decisions, it would be of some moment by whom they were made; but why should men feel anxious about the decisions of a judge, in whom they recognise no authority? Again, the power which was formerly vested in the person of the sovereign is now held in common among the king and the estates of the realm, and is exercised practically by the minister who has the confidence of the representatives of the people. While the determination of doctrine rests nominally therefore with the sovereign, it depends really on the popular opinion of the day. And this is exactly that arrangement which Pfaff suggested as accounting for the state of

things in Germany, and which he called the Consistorial system. So that while the forms of the Territorial system have remained, we have passed in reality to that other order of things, which has been shewn to be so intimately allied with Rationalism. The world in general, however, feels little repugnance at leaving the decision of religious questions to the sovereign power, because the sovereign power is virtually 'their noble selves.' The decision in Church matters on late occasions has avowedly been less influenced by the strict rules of law than by a reference to public opinion; and thus the formal Erastianism of our position is made tolerable by that virtual deference to the public sentiment, which is the essential feature of the Consistorial system."

Now, so far we have endeavoured to sum up, with scrupulous correctness, the author's own view of the Anglican relations between Church and State in these three periods: the first, which followed the Reformation; the second, which was introduced by the Revolution; and the third, which comprises our own times. We can keenly sympathise with what it has cost him to enter on so unpleasant a subject, to enter on it with courage and determined honesty; and to make statements so bitterly unpalatable to the communion of which he is an ornament. We feel for the son who has been called by an inexorable duty to probe the deep and deadly wound of a mother. We fervently pray that his feelings may be relieved by the discovery hereafter that the supposed parent was but an adventuress—a monarch's cast-off mistress, now in her dishonourable age vainly striving to cover her nakedness with the gifts which purchased her seduction—who stole him in his infancy from his true mother, and is unable to satisfy the yearnings of his manhood.

For to his *principles* throughout we have happily nothing to object, nor, again, as to the practical condition in which he considers his communion to lie, disastrous enough, even pitiable, if one might pity the enemy of God. But there is one point in which we think his view is radically defective, as to the distribution of authority between the Crown and the clergy at the Reformation. All the evils which he now deplores, that "renouncing the most precious part of the heritage of men," that "vesting in the sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed," "that vital denial of the independent existence of the spiritual society" (pp. 82-4), follow from and are involved in that distribution of authority which was originally made. Yet of this he speaks doubtingly. "It is impossible to say how much was intended to be assigned to the clergy, and how much to the crown, because the partition was neither fixed

by law nor explained in theory. It was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers" (p. 19). On the contrary, to us it appears that nothing can be more fixed, clear, and certain than this partition. Let us take Mr. Wilberforce's own criterion. "Let it once be admitted that spiritual mission is derived from the temporal power, and then it is plain that the authority which commits a trust has a right to withhold it, it will follow that to decide upon the doctrinal competency of those who are employed to teach belongs to the civil, and not to the spiritual power. And thus will the determination of doctrine become a matter of worldly cognisance, instead of being committed by inalienable right to Christ's spiritual body" (p. 18).

Therefore, in Mr. Wilberforce's judgment, which every Catholic theologian will confirm, all depends on the question from whom, after the settlement of the Reformation, the power of spiritual mission was derived in the Anglican Church.

But what is spiritual mission? Every Catholic will answer, that it is part of the power of spiritual jurisdiction, which assigns the conditions for *legitimate exercise* of the powers bestowed in orders; that is, it gives faculties to the priest, it confirms the bishop, it circumscribes the dioceses of bishops; it is the power, in short, which sets in motion, and preserves in its due action, the whole hierarchy or imperium of the Church. Nothing can be more simple, or more absolutely a first principle of Catholic theology.

But Mr. Wilberforce somehow shrinks from the use of the term 'spiritual jurisdiction,' and gives a definition of mission which seems to betray the usual Anglican inaccuracy. The Crown, he says (p. 13), "left the ministration of orders untouched." This, putting out of view the question of the validity of orders given by the Edwardian ritual, is admitted by Catholics. But further, "mission may mean either the spiritual commission which is derived from the Church, or the temporal permission to live in a certain locality. There might have been a more direct statement, that the Crown did not arrogate to itself the first; but there is no direct assertion which attributes to it more than the second." Now mission cannot mean "the temporal permission to live in a certain locality," for this is indisputably possessed by the temporal power in every state, Catholic, Protestant, or Heathen; by the Emperor in China, and the Grand Signor in Turkey, as well as by the temporal governments of Austria or of England. Certainly it was not for denying this that More and Fisher laid their heads on the block, nor for claiming it that Henry VIII. incurred excommunication. But perhaps by

the term "spiritual commission which is derived from the Church," which he elsewhere calls "the *continuance* of the commission bestowed in ordination" (p. 3), he means what a Catholic means by jurisdiction, *i. e.* the lawful exercise of the powers of order, and the having subjects whereon to exercise them. But then there is every legal proof that the Crown *did* arrogate to itself this power; that is, it claimed to be the fountain head of all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, nor did it only claim but became so by act of parliament, and has continued to be so, with the intermission of Mary's reign, to the present day. So far from not asserting, as Mr. Wilberforce will have it, it passed from assertion into action. This usurpation of the State begins with, and is plainly involved in, the statute of appeals, where the realm of England is stated to be "an empire, governed by one supreme head and king; unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality, were bounden and sworn to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." Now the king is indeed head of all persons spiritual and temporal, in their quality of citizens, and accordingly all, whether spiritual or temporal, owe him natural and humble obedience, *in the order of matters civil*; but he is not head of the spirituality *qua* spirituality, nor do spiritual persons owe him natural and humble obedience *in the order of matters spiritual*. For to assert this comes exactly to Mr. Wilberforce's definition of Erastianism, viz. "a system of opinions and course of action which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into a function of the civil government." For the possession of the divine powers conferred by ordination, when the use and exercise of those powers are directed and circumscribed by the State, does not leave to the Church an independent existence; and even real bishops, when confirmed in their sees by the civil power, and so deriving their spiritual jurisdiction from that power unto the several authorities dependent on them, become a function of the temporal government. Now the Anglican reformation was but the carrying out of this idea. Thus Bishop Gibson in his *Codex*, pref. p. 18, acknowledges "that the external administration of spiritual discipline and of all ecclesiastical matters, in established courts, and established forms, is by authority from the Crown and in subordination to the royal supremacy." This, he imagines, "takes off the reproach on the one hand of her affecting an independence;" as, on the other hand, the divine rights conveyed in orders to that of being "a mere creature of the State." Other Anglican writers, when they have proved

the recognition by the State of spiritual powers existing in the reformed bishops, imagine they have proved what is sufficient for the Church's "independent existence" in Mr. Wilberforce's sense; whereas the very purpose of Henry and Elizabeth was to have a real hierarchy, nominated, confirmed, maintained in action, corrected, *ruled* in short, by themselves. They coveted only the power which the Pope had held, of being *head*; they did not wish to destroy or impair the body, but to derive intact that continual directive power and influence, and to exert that control, which constitute supremacy. A wise monarch does not impair the several powers of his subordinate magistrates, but he takes care that their dependence on himself be unquestionable; and so the Tudor sovereigns carefully maintained the spiritual powers of their bishops, only making them entirely subordinate to themselves in the acquisition, maintenance, and exercise of those powers. Now, in one word, this is a supremacy of jurisdiction, and it includes spiritual mission as one of its parts. Nor can any words be more express and distinct than those of the acts of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, which ascribe this whole supremacy of jurisdiction to the temporal monarch. Still more convincing is this language when they not only declare that ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the temporal monarch, but that the Papal authority, which consists in that very jurisdiction, "robs the king of his honour, right, and pre-eminence" (28 Henry VIII. Gibson's *Codex*, p. 25). Thus the act 37 Henry VIII. cap. 17, declares, "Whereas the royal majesty is justly supreme head in earth of the Church of England, and hath full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies, schisms, errors, vices, and to exercise all other manner of jurisdictions commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdictions." It is added that "the archbishops and bishops have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical but by, under, and from the royal majesty" (Gibson, p. 44). See also 1 Edward VI. c. 2: "All authority of jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, is derived and deduced from the king's majesty as supreme head of these churches and realms of England and Ireland, and so justly acknowledged by the clergy of the said realms; so that all courts ecclesiastical within the said two realms be kept by no other power or authority, either foreign or within the realm, but by the authority of his most excellent majesty" (Gibson, p. 926). The body of ecclesiastical laws called "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*" may at least be quoted, though never absolutely law, as a complete exhibition of the mind of those who wrought the change in religion; and it states, as Mr. Wilberforce remembers, that,

“the king has, and can exercise, the fullest jurisdiction, both civil and ecclesiastical, as well over archbishops and bishops, clergy and other ministers, as over laws, within his own realms and dominions.” It is moreover stated in some of these acts, that he has this power “by God’s law,” and that every monarch has the same in his own realm, which is at least consistent. Mary’s reign having swept away this new spiritual supremacy, the 1st Eliz. c. i. brought it back. The 10th sect. renews the laws of Henry touching the supremacy; reviving eight acts of his, and declaring that the branches, sentences, and words of them shall be deemed and taken to extend to her highness, her heirs, and successors, as fully and largely as ever the precedents did extend to the late King Henry VIII. (Gibson, p. 43). That the queen claimed exactly the same supremacy as her father and brother, is stated in her injunctions (Gibson, p. 54). “Certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any authority than that was challenged and lastly used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI.,” though she adds, insidiously and falsely, “which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm.” But her power is in the same act, sect. 17, more expressly defined as the very same which had been exercised by the Pope: that it “please your highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, *as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used* for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever by authority of this present parliament be ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.” And the 19th sect. imposes an oath on all ecclesiastical persons that, “to my power I shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences and authorities granted or belonging unto the queen’s highness, her heirs, and successors, or ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.” Surely it is hard upon Tudor lawyers and Tudor sovereigns to state after this, “that it is impossible to say how much (in the distribution of authority) was intended to be assigned to the clergy and how much to the Crown, because the partition was neither fixed by law nor explained in theory.”

But these are acts of the State—yes, submitted to and acted upon by the Church, and guarded under threat of excommunication! for the second Canon of 1603 declares, that

“whosoever shall hereafter impeach *any part of the king's regal supremacy* in causes ecclesiastical restored to the Crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked errors.” Let it be well observed, that not merely the supremacy, as defined in the 37th article, “the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes,” though that is strong enough and plain enough, but the supremacy “by the laws of this realm established” by the very acts of the Tudor princes, is thus guarded and imposed by the Church herself. Hard, again, to say, that the distribution of Church authority “was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers.” For let us add the very plain and specific words of one of the greatest (Hooker, vol. iii. p. 543):

“There is required an universal power which reacheth over all, importing supreme authority of government over all courts, all judges, all causes; the operation of which power is as well to strengthen, maintain, and uphold particular jurisdictions, which haply might else be of small effect, as also to remedy that which they are not able to help, and to redress that wherein they at any time do otherwise than they ought to do. This power being sometimes in the Bishop of Rome, who, by simple practices, had drawn it into his hands, was for just considerations, by public consent, annexed unto the king's royal seat and crown. From whence the authors of reformation would translate it into their national assemblies or synods; which synods are the only help which they think lawful to use against such evils in the Church as particular jurisdictions are not sufficient to redress. In which case our laws have provided that the king's supereminent authority and power shall serve, as namely, when the whole ecclesiastical, or the principal persons therein, do need visitation and reformation. When in any part of the Church, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities, are grown, which men in their several jurisdictions either do not or cannot help, *whatsoever any spiritual authority or power*, such as legates from the see of Rome would exercise, *hath done, or might heretofore have done, for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort* (that is to say, without the violation of the law of God, or nature, in the deed done), *as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the king for ever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work, that the thing may be their act, and the king their motion unto it, but by commissioners, few or many, who, having the*

king's letters patent, may, on the virtue thereof, execute the premises, as agents in the right *not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his supereminent power.*"

There is one statement on which Mr. Wilberforce seems to rely a great deal in estimating the amount of authority left to the spirituality at the reformation. He recurs to it again and again, as if it yielded him firm ground at least of principle among all the shifting sands of contrary practice and Erastian precedents. He sets his feet upon it and refuses to move, as if he would say, Though all that I hate and deplore actually prevails; yet it ought not so to be: the Church has been betrayed, the compact with her broken; she is insulted, depressed, but at least not herself a traitress. This stone of the god Terminus is the declaration of the 20th Anglican Article, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," on which he observes, "nothing can be more distinct than the general statement that all matters of doctrine are to be decided by the Church, by virtue of that divine commission to teach, with which it was invested by Christ our Lord" (p. 13). And referring to the statute of appeals, he says, to the like effect, "though an arbitrary and dangerous power was thus committed to the Crown, there was reason to hope that it would be exercised in conformity with the statements to which the Crown was a party, that the decision of doctrine rested with the spirituality." Now no doubt the statute recited (and last year this clause was again and again quoted by those desirous to make out the most favourable case for the liberty of the Anglican Church), "that when any clause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and shewed by *that part* of the said body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church." But the same statute declared that this spirituality, as *part* of the body politic, "was bounden and owen to bear, *next to God*, a natural and humble obedience to its supreme head and king." As the temporality was imperfect without its head, so was the spirituality. Just so when it is said, "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," it means, not the body of the Church *without* its head, but *with* it,—the whole Church, head and body both; the spirituality, with its "supreme head," the Crown. To a Catholic these words would have a perfectly distinct and Catholic meaning; they would signify that the Episcopate, with its head and crown, the Pope, hath authority in controversies of faith. To an Anglican they have also a distinct, but a very uncatholic meaning; they signify, the body spiritual, with its

“one supreme head and king,” hath authority in controversies of faith. No doubt archbishops, and bishops, and other Church dignitaries, were meant to be *used* in what Mr. Wilberforce calls “the Episcopate system” set up by Henry and Elizabeth; but the enactive power, the supreme force, was to be given to all that they did, to their canons, to their judgments, by him, or by her, whom they had set up to be their head. But is Mr. Wilberforce aware of the very curious fact, that this much-trusted clause was not at all in the articles as presented to Queen Elizabeth; that Cranmer had confined himself to stating that “the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies,” and that the Tudor mastiff-tigress, with a stroke of her pen, put in the clause on which he rests so much, having a juster as well as a bolder notion of Church authority than the tools she was using, and being fully minded that the Church, with herself for its head, should be just as strong, and have just as great a claim on the conscience, as the Church with the Pope for its head? Her favourite secretary Cecil only expressed the policy of his father and his mistress when he said, that “whatever the Pope had done in the Church, the Queen could do.” And this clause rested in obscurity till it was brought out and built upon by the divines of James and Charles. Hooker, in the passage just quoted, goes, it will be observed, as far as Cecil; for the power which, he says, our laws have fully granted to the king includes that exercised in the Gorham judgment. In truth, it being granted that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, since controversies of faith touch the whole body, that authority will be exercised by the supreme power in the Church, as we have just seen in the case of Queen Victoria, who has determined that the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism is an “open question;” just as, if the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception pass from universal private belief into a dogma of faith, it must be, and can only be, by the judgment of St. Peter’s See.

Now, to sum up the powers which composed this royal spiritual supremacy imposed on the Church at the reformation. We have seen it begun by the statute of appeals calling the realm of England a body politic, containing a temporalty and a spirituality under the king’s headship. And so it was a political combination from beginning to end,—just as the present English mind refuses to consider the Catholic hierarchy in any but a political aspect, which it calls Papal aggression,—and the supremacy, thus inaugurated, had, when completed, a singular correspondence in its two parts, as it affected the temporalty and the spirituality. In both it was

thoroughly political; in both it was legislative, executive, and judicial. Legislative, for as the crown convokes Parliament, and by its assent makes their votes to be laws, so it gives the archbishop license for convocations or synods to meet, as well as adds the enactive force to their canons, without which they are void of coercive power. And the old power of issuing proclamations seems more than paralleled by the imposition of an entirely new prayer-book on the spirituality without their concurrence, up to the canons of 1603. It is executive, for as the crown nominates civil officers, and conducts the machinery of ordinary government through them, so it not only nominates bishops for election, but orders an office to confirm them when elected, that is, to give them spiritual mission; and should the proper officer refuse, it may nominate others, his inferiors, to do the work over his head. Let Archdeacon Wilberforce well consider this provision of the law, for it is decisive as to the source of spiritual mission. Nor does it matter that not a single Anglican archbishop has had courage to refuse consecration to the crown's presentee during three hundred years, however objectionable as to faith or as to morals, so that the provision has never been acted on. It is judicial, for as all temporal courts of justice act by the crown's authority, so the spiritual courts are courts of the bishops, who are crown officers, while supreme judgment in the last resort belongs to the crown, now in a court of privy councillors, formerly in a court of delegates, deriving jurisdiction from it. The only difficulty in estimating the nature and extent of this supremacy arises from the dull, gross, and political manner in which it grasps spiritual powers; such, for instance, as that of jurisdiction, which is theologically divided into external, *in foro exteriori*, and internal, *in foro interiori*; whereas the state in its eagerness after the former, seems to have cared little what became of the latter, as it only dealt with souls and consciences, and sin and the condition of men before God, while external jurisdiction belonged to the Church as the great visible empire of God upon earth, having its own most stately majesty and most orderly arrangement, its outward unity and universal citizenship, which even a Henry and an Elizabeth could appreciate. This, in the fulness of their flesh, they saw, and lusted for, and ravaged; but that, in the utter leanness of their souls, perhaps they left to their underlings, perhaps they thought not of at all.

Now, supposing the Elizabethan episcopacy to have possessed all those sacred powers which are given by consecration, and in order, and so are indelible, yet the power of spiritual mission is not one of these, even according to Archdea-

con Wilberforce's own shewing, and it is absolutely necessary for the *valid* exercise of some of these powers of order, and for the *legitimate* exercise of all; for instance, without it a validly ordained bishop cannot forgive sins, for he has no subjects. Why is it that no Anglican will look this question of the source of spiritual jurisdiction in the face? Why will no one tell us how Bishops Barlow and Scory, Hogskin and Coverdale, could give Dr. Parker spiritual mission to the see of Canterbury, or who did give it him but Queen Elizabeth, and how she had it to give? It is surely not honourable or conscientious to refuse to meet that one point on which, supposing them to be true bishops, the legitimacy of the whole Anglican, American, Scotch, and Colonial episcopate rests. We earnestly press this matter on the notice of Archdeacon Wilberforce. If he will enter with his characteristic honesty into this question of spiritual jurisdiction, we are sure, with his keen appreciation of the Church's constitution, as a divine system of belief and practice, a spiritual empire, that the doubtfulness which now appears to linger on him will vanish: the bride of Christ will appear to him in her matchless beauty.

The sovereign in England, then, was bent on taking the Pope's place over the spirituality, and he took it in spite of all absurdities and anomalies; he mounted the chariot of the sun: what wonder that the earth is dried up and parched and in full conflagration! What wonder that the hearts of Anglican Churchmen are fainting for fear, looking for vital warmth and kindness, and finding death instead! In spiritual matters, around them is a desolate wilderness, and all faces gather blackness. They have no one to look to. Their bishops are a proverb of reproach in their mouths, of cowardice and unmanliness. Their wisest and most thoughtful divines fret away their heart in the solitude of their parishes, unable to defend, yet fearing to condemn. If ever an army was in rout, they are routed. Not a banner is raised to the rescue. Not a watchword goes through the ranks. O misery of miseries! To them the Church of Christ is a kingdom divided against itself; to them the city of light is eclipsed in darkness; to them the dove, the undefiled one, lies in a nest of dark heresies; to them the body of Christ has its members tearing each other to pieces. Oh, pray for all hearts tender and true, that they be delivered from this hideous temptation to infidelity, and enter into the kingdom of truth, of light, and of peace!

We turn from this question raised by Archdeacon Wilberforce, observing only further that cruelly as he may be pained at the present state of things, shocked as every Catholic principle within him must be, he cannot, as we think

we have proved, assure himself, or defend his communion, on the ground that the "Episcopal system" set up at the Reformation has been infringed as to the primary terms of its compact. The crown is no more supreme now than it was then. It is the distinctive work of the reformation which he reprehends, not a corruption and perversion of that work. The glorious doctrine of the Word made flesh has borne his spirit aloft into a purer region; he has once gazed upon the fountain of light; he longs for its warmth, and is clothed and suffocated among the fogs of Anglicanism.

For where in the Thirty-nine Articles, or in the range of Anglican Church literature—for theology there is none—will he find the following view of the Church? "The Christian faith was originally proclaimed *as the germinant principle of a society*; and it cannot be otherwise than important that it should be perpetuated among ourselves under conditions not inconsistent with its original constitution and organic laws" (p. 1). "Thus did the intuitive conceptions of the Christian mind become fixed in authoritative expressions. The results of private thought and individual reverence acquired a form and shape, when they were embodied in dogmatic words by those who had authority to enjoin them. As the moral instincts of nature assume a new character when common consent has stamped them with the authority of laws, so that instinctive feeling with which Christians regarded the mysteries of the unseen world was matured by the Church's judgment into the Catholic faith" (p. 136). "His guiding grace, the living principle of his mystic body, which had first dwelt in fulness in his Apostles as a gift of inspiration, was understood to dwell as a gift of interpretation in the collective episcopate. This was a point on which the ancient Church was as well qualified to give evidence, as any other on which its verdict is accepted. Do we accept its judgment that the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Revelation of St. John should be admitted into the sacred Canon; and can we deny the verdict which it had previously pronounced, that the most sacred doctrines were to be understood according to that view of truth into which the Holy Ghost guided its collective Fathers?" (p. 134.) "The Church's authority does not interfere with the observations of sense or the inferences of reason; its province is that spiritual intuition which pronounces upon doctrines. And its witness is as conclusive in declaring the faith, as that of logic in explaining our ideas, or that of sense in communicating phenomena" (p. 139). "Natural intuition must be exercised in subordination to the testimony of humanity; spiritual to the testimony of the Church. The first has its origin

in that plastic power which appoints our nature; the second in that pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the whole body of Christ is animated. Rationalism, then, is that system of opinion which puts the first of these principles in place of the second. It does not positively reject religion, or disown Scripture, but recognises no higher criterion than the judgment of mankind and the principles of nature. It supposes that the mass of men are competent in themselves to arrive at truth, because, through the multiplicity of opinions, opposite errors will eliminate one another. And therefore it either denies inspiration altogether, or denies at least that principle of divine guidance, which is the necessary correlative of inspiration. In the first case it supposes the contents of Scripture to be discoverable by natural reason; in the second it supposes the canon of Scripture to be fixed by feeling or criticism; not by that guiding Spirit which directs the Church. Thus does Rationalism dethrone and destroy that presiding principle which unites the body of Christ into one organic whole. For Church authority has been shewn to be no arbitrary rule, but the result of that indwelling grace whereby the religious intuitions of individuals are matured into the Catholic faith" (p. 141).

It would seem that Archdeacon Wilberforce has deeply entered into what is called the doctrine of development. The principles here set forth are a real support and comfort to the Catholic, to whom the first, and the nineteenth, and every intervening or future century, must be bound together in one intimate union; who realises in his every-day worship the blessed truth of the Church's infallible guidance; but what must they be to one who is required to believe and avow that, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith:" and that "General Councils, when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and word of God), may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God" (19th and 21st Articles).

But if Mr. Wilberforce underrates greatly in our judgment the original evil done at the reformation to the independence of the Anglican Church's spiritual existence, at least he is far from blind to the misery of her present condition. Let it be remembered that the following statements are wrung, we doubt not with anguish of heart, from that one of all her actual sons who has most distinguished himself in the study of dogmatic truth, a dignitary withal, and the bro-

ther of a bishop, and the bearer of a venerable name. It is no enemy, but a child, high in position, higher in ability, who thus pronounces on questions which he knows will touch the heart, and perhaps influence the conduct of many.

"It was reserved for the year 1850 to see the Territorial system, or pure Erastianism, display itself in its full dimensions, and effect its full evils in England" (p. 77). And Erastianism is "the absorption of the Church by the civil government, the resolution of Christ's kingdom into a function of the state. In Erastianism the institutions of the old swallow up those of the new creation, and nature triumphs over grace" (p. 71). "To prescribe that none shall be appointed to the office of bishop, except by the sovereign, is to affirm the principle of Erastianism; it is to usurp the spiritual functions of the Church of Christ" (p. 74). "Such is the theory of the Church of England as exhibited in her laws; but such is *not* the practice, as illustrated by her actions. It would be difficult to find a more glaring contrast than between the prosperity of her apparent state, and the misery of her real situation. She claims to be the depository of a divine truth, which she has a super-human commission to deliver; but the worldly power has in reality taken possession of her frame, and gives expression to its will through her organs of utterance." (This fact, which we see before our eyes, is the most exact and complete carrying out of Henry VIIIth's original idea, as first set forth in the statute of appeals, and illustrated in so many succeeding acts.) "She claims to be the salt of the earth, and she is in reality trodden under foot of men. This is the result of causes long in progress; but its consummation was the transference of the right of deciding respecting doctrine from spiritual to civil rulers; from those who possess authority in Christ's spiritual kingdom, to those whom God's providence has invested with natural power." (Which, again, was done in 1534, and not in 1850.) "No question of doctrine, however fundamental, can at present come into discussion in any court of the Church of England, in which the civil power would not finally interpret, explain, and define the will of God, and require the Church's officers to give effect to its interpretations." (And this, it must be added, would have been equally done by the court of delegates, nominated by the Crown, and deriving their jurisdiction from the Crown, not *necessarily* ecclesiastics from the beginning, nor *actually* so from the restoration; though not this, but the *source* of their jurisdiction is the real point at issue.) "And since the legislative powers of the Church are held in abeyance by penal statutes, its whole action is concentrated in that judicial department, of

which it has been thus despoiled" (p. 145). For, as he elsewhere quotes Hoadly, "Whosoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them;" from Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 673.

The abstract injustice of all this is undoubted; but then it is the original pact; it is at this price that the Establishment has bought its civil status. What the Archdeacon has now discovered, Catholic writers from the commencement of the schism have not ceased to point out. For instance, Suarez, in the reign of James I., wrote a great volume against Anglicanism, which we recommend very heartily to Archdeacon Wilberforce's notice. Now he will find (vol. xxi. lib. 3, c. 7, p. 130,) that Suarez makes the particular Anglican error to consist, not in *denying* that there is a spiritual jurisdiction *in foro exteriori* for the Church's government, but in *annexing* it to the supreme temporal jurisdiction; the very point which he is now deploring as a new thing. "The mysteries of religion only, and the divine laws of the kingdom of Christ, are referred to those who do not possess the qualifications needed to decide them. And observe the effect of this intrusion upon sacred functions. It interferes with that law which has been shewn to be a fundamental principle of the Church of Christ. It takes, as the ultimate judge in questions of doctrine, a human in place of a divine authority. The properties of the individual mind remain as they were before; but when we ask for that guiding principle by which the intentions of individuals are combined and directed, instead of a power which claims divine, we find one which claims human origin. Now this was shewn to be the fundamental principle of Rationalism. For Rationalism likewise is the substitution of nature, as the final criterion, instead of grace." Here, again, Suarez has anticipated the author, for he told James I. that such was the basis of his religious establishment; and the British Solon, not being able to burn his person, burnt his book. "Like Erastianism, it supposes that the impressions of men are to be moulded together merely by a natural rule; and that earthly wisdom and authority is a competent judge in matters of faith. Hence the fantastic reveries of the speculative German. Among our own countrymen, more inclined to political combinations than philosophic theories, the same tendency assumes a practical shape. They claim to dispense with that historical system which conveys to us the Church's judgment, because they have a sufficient criterion of truth and falsehood in their national good sense.

The English people is too great to need any help in the settlement of its religion; it is able to elaborate a creed for itself out of those ancient documents, in which it is its will to place confidence. It will no more be dictated to in religion than in politics or in taste; and the people's mind will be reflected by the judgment of its rulers" (p. 147).

Things ought to be true which are concurred in by opposed authorities, for Archdeacon Wilberforce preaches before the University of Oxford on Sunday, May 18, 1851, much to the same effect as F. Newman at the London Oratory in May 1850; and as his words are a most graphic description of that Erastianism, "the base and hateful features of whose real character" (p. 40) we are thankful to our author for exposing to his countrymen, we will terminate with them this notice of a most useful little book.

"We have not to inquire what is the dogma of a collegiate, antiquarian religion, but what, in the words of the prime minister, will give 'general satisfaction;' what is the religion of Britons. May not the freeborn, self-dependent animal mind of the Englishman choose his religion for himself? And have lawyers more to do than to state, as a matter of fact and history, what that religion is, and for three centuries has been? Are we to obtrude the mysteries of an external, of a dogmatic, of a revealed system, on a nation which intimately feels and has established that each individual is to be his own judge of truth and falsehood in matters of the unseen world? How is it possible that the national Church, forsooth, should be allowed to dogmatise on the point which so immediately affects the nation itself? Why, half the country is unbaptised; it is difficult to say, for certain, who are baptised; shall the country unchristianise itself? it has not yet advanced to indifference on such a matter. Shall it, by a suicidal act, use its own Church against itself, as its instrument to cut itself off from the hope of another life? Shall it confine the Christian promises within limits, and put restrictions upon grace, when it has thrown open trade, removed disabilities, abolished monopolies, taken off agricultural protection, and enlarged the franchise? . . . The giant ocean has suddenly swelled and heaved, and majestically yet masterfully snaps the cables of the small craft which lie upon its bosom, and strands them upon the beach. Hooker, Taylor, Bull, Pearson, Barrow, Tillotson, Warburton, and Horne, names mighty in their generation, are broken and wrecked before the power of a nation's will. One vessel alone can ride those waves,—the boat of Peter, the ark of God."

DR. ACHILLI AND THE INQUISITION.

Dealings with the Inquisition; or, Papal Rome, her Priests and her Jesuits: with important Disclosures. By the Rev. Giacinto Achilli, D.D. London, Arthur Hall; Virtue and Co. 1851.

Dell' Introduzione del Protestantismo in Italia; o sia la Chiesa Cattolica difesa colle Testimonianze de' Protestanti. Per Agostino Theiner, Sacerdote dell' Oratorio. [*On the Introduction of Protestantism into Italy; or the Catholic Church defended by the Testimonies of Protestants.* By Augustin Theiner, Priest of the Oratory. Naples and Rome, 1851.]

WE do not know which most to admire in the book that stands first at the head of our present article, its folly or its effrontery; its folly, considered only with reference to its own manifest absurdities, self-contradictions, falsehoods, and impossibilities; or its effrontery, considered with reference to the circumstances under which it makes its appearance before the tribunal of public opinion in this country. It will be in the recollection of our readers that certain events, professing to be passages from the life of the author of this work, were published to the world about a twelvemonth ago; first in the pages of a Quarterly Review, and then independently as a separate publication; and that in this publication crimes of the most revolting character were laid to the charge of the individual in question, not in any vague and doubtful manner, or in merely general terms, but with the utmost positiveness, and with a distinct enumeration of times and places and persons, and many other circumstances. When, therefore, we take up the present volume, published six or seven months after these charges had been publicly preferred against the author, and find that, in the course of a long autobiography occupying nearly 500 pages, no mention is made of them, or rather that they *are* mentioned (or at least very distinctly alluded to), and yet that no attempt is made to refute them, we are certainly lost in astonishment; we can only conclude that the author feels the task of vindication to be either impossible or unnecessary; and, of course, it may be unnecessary, either because he has already fallen, and fallen hopelessly, from the high position which he once occupied in the

(so-called) Evangelical world; or because his canonisation is complete, and not a word that may now be said can be allowed to throw any doubt on the validity of the decree by which it was effected. For ourselves, we are not sufficiently familiar with the calendar of Exeter Hall to be able to say which of these alternatives represents the true state of the case; but judging from the character of the work before us, we should say it must needs be one or the other. Certainly these "dealings with the Inquisition" do *not* seem to be the work of a man conscious that he is *upon his trial*. And yet we should have thought that he could not but feel himself to be in that position; and moreover, the very publication of this autobiography in *any* shape, under the circumstances, would seem tantamount to an acknowledgment that such was his real position. If so, it is clear that he entertains but the very meanest opinion both of the learning and the judgment of those who have to pronounce his sentence, otherwise he could not possibly have ventured to set before them such manifest falsehoods as are contained in the present work. A few of these falsehoods we think it worth while to expose, though we are happy to be able to assure our readers, that in so doing we shall have no occasion to repeat any of those disgusting matters to which we have thus briefly alluded. If Achilli himself is contented that such imputations should lie upon his character, it is not for us to object; we shall go on therefore to examine this new work of his by the ordinary rules of criticism, without any reference to the very unusual circumstances under which it is brought before the public.

First, then, we must warn our readers that the contents of the work by no means correspond to the title; in fact, the title is a mere clap-trap to ensnare unwary purchasers; Dr. Achilli's "dealings with the Inquisition" form but a very insignificant portion of the book to which he has chosen to affix this name, considerably less than a tithe of the whole; the rest is taken up with an account of "my creed, my conversion, my exile, my mission, my Italian Church, my farewell to Rome, my views of Naples and the Neapolitans, &c., &c.;" all very well in their way, no doubt, but not half so attractive as a true and faithful account of Dr. Achilli's dealings with the Inquisition, or rather of the Inquisition's dealings with Dr. Achilli, would have been. Former narratives of his life had given us to understand that he was twice a prisoner of the Inquisition, and the same thing is told us in the present volume. Now it is no common sight in the nineteenth century to see a man who has ever had any thing at all to do with that awe-inspiring tribunal; what shall we say then of a man who has

actually been twice imprisoned in its dungeons? Surely such a man must have an almost infinite store of really authentic information, that would be most interesting and valuable to the Protestant public; and surely this is the volume in which we should expect to find it. "Dealings with the Inquisition; or Papal Rome, her priests and Jesuits: *with important disclosures*, by Dr. Achilli." What more can be desired? "This will be the text-book," we said to ourselves when first we took the volume in hand,— "this will be the text-book for all Protestant controversialists and declaimers at Exeter Hall and other places throughout the kingdom during the next twenty years upon the subject of this tribunal, already so great an object of abhorrence to our fellow-countrymen; we must read it therefore very carefully, diligently sift all its statements, and publish the result of our inquiries, that so Catholics may be provided with the necessary armour of defence against weapons that are sure to be drawn from this well-stocked arsenal." Such was our feeling when first we sat down to read the book; but when we found ourselves at the end of the volume, and came to look at the notes which we had made of all that concerned the Inquisition, what was our surprise to find that it amounted to *vox et præterea nihil*, the title and nothing else. Of his own dealings with the Inquisition there is literally nothing, beyond the fact already mentioned that he was imprisoned by it twice; and even of this we have the most meagre barren notice that can possibly be conceived. We are told that he "had occasion to leave Naples on account of some important business which called him to Rome in the year 1841" (p. 358), that is, in plainer English, and according to the biography furnished in the publication we have before alluded to, he was expelled from Naples by order of the police on the 2d of February in that year, and he went to Rome; by and by, when he was "on the point of leaving Rome to return to Naples, he was arrested by an invisible enemy, and that enemy was the Inquisition." Here the reader's curiosity is naturally raised to the highest pitch of expectation; there is something in the selection and arrangement of the words calculated to increase this feeling; now at last he flatters himself that he is going to have some of those "important disclosures" that were promised him in the title-page, and that tempted him perhaps to procure the book; now he will hear all about the thumb-screws, the rack, and all the other instruments of torture; now he will gain a real insight into the most hidden secrets of that terrible prison-house. But, alas, all his expectations are most cruelly disappointed; after five pages of vague assertions about the part which was taken by some

of "those wretched monks of Naples," first in "chanting their hymn of victory" over his apprehension, and then in getting up "various documents relating to his cause," we are landed at the end of the chapter without a single syllable of information as to the charge upon which he had been arrested, the way in which his arrest was effected by this invisible enemy, the manner of conducting his trial, the hardships and cruelties he endured during his imprisonment, the way in which he was ultimately released, nor, in fact, any one particular worth mentioning, which can fairly be called his "dealings with the Inquisition." We are told that "those who at that juncture sought to oppress and calumniate me, have come to shame and confusion;" and then we are hastily transported to another scene: "It was in the month of September 1842, that I found myself beyond the walls of Rome, in the province of Sabina, in a fine country near Nazzano" (p. 364). To fill up this *hiatus* between the arrest in Rome in 1841 at the end of chapter xii., and this sojourn "in a fine country near Nazzano" in the autumn of 1842, at the beginning of chapter xiii., our author supplies literally nothing: perhaps he thought that there was no necessity for adding to the very distinct information upon this head which had been already given by the writer in the *Dublin Review*, viz. that when arraigned before the Inquisition, both for his false doctrine and gross immoralities, he confessed his guilt and submitted to any punishment that might be imposed; in consideration of which submission he received the very lenient sentence of banishment for three years to the remote and secluded convent of his order in that "fine country near Nazzano." Perhaps, we say, he thought his readers would be satisfied with this account of the matter; at any rate, he has not chosen to supply them with any other, and we can only conclude therefore, either that he acknowledges the truth of this, or that the truth being really something worse, he wisely adopts the homely maxim of "the least said, soonest mended."

But it is not only on the subject of the Inquisition that this author's performance is so unequal to his promises; it is a general characteristic of the whole book; from first to last, the reader is perpetually tantalised by having the most tempting subjects of information just set before him, so as to awaken his appetite, and then suddenly withdrawn from him.

The second chapter professes to give us some account "of the subjects treated upon in this narrative;" and certainly never was a bill of fare set before a hungry guest more utterly at variance with the viands actually supplied to him, than is this chapter of promises when compared with the sub-

sequent performance of them. It would be quite an endless task to enumerate *all* the questions which he has here proposed, and to which he has promised an answer, but which, in fact, never occur again in any part of the work. Some of these questions being of a somewhat dry and abstract nature, the breach of promise may escape the notice of many readers, or if noticed at all, may be accounted a subject of congratulation rather than of complaint; there are others, on the other hand, which are precisely those points of interest upon which, our curiosity having once been raised, we desire the fullest information; and here the omission can scarcely fail to have been noticed even by the most careless, and resented even by the meekest of readers. Thus, he promises to “detail *accurately* the transactions of the French with regard to himself, that no future historian may deceive the world by a false account” (p. 27). Yet when it comes to the proper place to redeem this promise, we are told that “the *capitaine rapporteur* said certain things to me which I forbear to mention, as well as some other things of little import to any one but myself, for fear of causing trouble to parties still remaining in Rome” (p. 484); in fact, he merely tells us what every one knew before, that he escaped “through the assistance of the French Government;” but how this assistance was rendered, what motives induced them to render it, who was the principal agent in the transaction, and every other interesting particular (which is what we understand by *accurate details*, and some of which had been specifically mentioned and promised), is left in the same obscurity as before, and future historians may still deceive the world by a false account, spite of Achilli’s solemn assurances to the contrary. Then, again, there are two circumstances upon which we are more especially told that the author will “dwell *at large*, under the impression that those persons for whom he chiefly writes will be greatly interested in a *minute account of all that took place on those occasions*. I refer,” he says, “to my examination before the Judge of the Inquisition, and my conference with the Theologian of the same establishment, who was sent to endeavour by his arguments to bring me back to the Church of Rome” (p. 27). And presently we are again assured that (p. 28) “the conferences between the Theologian of the Romish Church and myself will occupy an important portion of this work.” Here, surely, is a most distinct engagement on the part of the author to tell us *every thing* about these conferences; he expressly says that he is anxious, “not only that all that passed between us may be known, but that the manner of it may also be understood” (p. 28). And how is this engagement fulfilled? The whole

space allotted to the "minute account" of both these circumstances, both the examination and the conferences, does not exceed nine pages; so that what was promised to be "an important portion of the work" proves to be less than a hundredth part of it; and even this scanty fragment consists for the most part of the merest commonplaces and vague generalities, and, moreover, as we shall presently see, is utterly and entirely false.

So much, then, concerning the way in which the author of this work fulfils his own promises, and concerning those things which he ought to have told us, but has not. Let us next look at the character of what he really *has* told us. We have said that it is full of falsehoods, self-contradictions, and absurdities; and it will not be difficult to prove the accuracy of our charge. As a specimen of falsehood and self-contradiction, compare the two versions of the same story that are given us in chapters v. and xiv. The two passages stand as follows: in page 107 we read,

"It is notorious that in Constantinople, in the year 1847, an Armenian priest, Don Giovanni Keosse, although an Ottoman subject and born in Constantinople, was seized in the night by four bullies from the Austrian embassy, and hurried into a steamer, to be conveyed as a prisoner to Marseilles, and thence to Rome, to be handed over to the Inquisition. And all this took place by order of the Armenian Catholic Bishop. This Keosse, who was confined in a cabin on board the steamer, found means to effect his escape, by slipping through the window into a boat, while the vessel was disembarking a part of its passengers and goods at Smyrna. He subsequently put himself under the protection of the American Consul; and the Austrian, finding himself discovered, gave up the affair, and so it ended. Keosse, however, did not feel at all sure of his safety from the grasp of the Inquisition so long as he remained under the Ottoman Government; and being advised to go to Malta, he went there without delay, and there he remains at the present period."

So far, so good; here is at least a perfectly intelligible story, and one which will commend itself to all good Protestants that read it, as very natural and probable: a poor innocent unoffending priest, seized in the night by the emissaries of the Inquisition and hurried on board a steamer, and all this by order of the Catholic Bishop; and then the persecuted individual making his escape and flying for safety to the British flag in the Island of Malta: this is as it should be; every body in the story fills his proper place and appears in his appropriate character. But now let us turn to p. 390, and lo, in what different colours do we find the same scene painted!

Achilli is enumerating his coadjutors in the Protestant Theological College at Malta, and he says :

“ A fifth came from Smyrna, an Armenian priest named Giovanni Keosse, who stated that he had escaped through the assistance of a Bishop, and under the protection of the Austrian ambassador, from the clutches of the Roman Inquisition, which had laid hold of him at Constantinople . . . He came in a furtive sort of manner, and the reports I received concerning him were by no means to his advantage, so that I began to suspect some evil design on his part, and in fact he soon shewed himself in his proper colours . . . he then thought fit to throw off the mask ; he was an agent of the opposite party. . . . This Keosse, after having accomplished his mission . . . turned Protestantism into derision, and elated the Jesuits with their victory, now turned his back on the Malta Protestant College, and repaired to Rome to receive the reward of his labours ; doubtless he will be made a bishop.”

We beg our readers to mark well the discrepancies between these two passages, for indeed they are of no ordinary kind ; we certainly never remember to have seen two versions of the same story told in the same book by the same writer more utterly at variance with one another. First, as to the authority on which the story rests : in the one case we are told that it is a matter of public notoriety ; in the other, that it was Keosse's own statement ; but it is insinuated that Keosse was not a man whose statements could be trusted. Then, as to the story itself : in the one case, he is seized by order of the Armenian Catholic Bishop, and immediately by the servants of the Austrian embassy, and he effects his escape by means of his own cleverness, by slipping through a cabin-window into a boat ; in the other, it is precisely under the protection of the Austrian Ambassador, and through the assistance of a bishop, that he makes his escape from the clutches of the Inquisition. In the one case, he is the *victim* of this merciless tribunal ; in the other, he is its *agent*. In the one case, not feeling sure of his safety from the grasp of the Inquisition, he goes to Malta, “ *and there he remains at the present period ;*” in the other, he “ turns his back on the Malta Protestant College, and repairs to Rome to receive ”—what ? perpetual imprisonment in the dungeons of the Inquisition ? Nothing of the kind ; but on the contrary, “ the reward of his labours ; doubtless he will be made a bishop.” Can any thing be more patent than this self-contradiction ? And yet the writer has the boldness to declare that he is actuated solely by a love of truth in coming before the public at all : “ My sole motive,” he says (p. 18), “ has been to make the truth evident, that all

may apprehend it. It was for hearing and speaking the truth, that I incurred the hatred of the Papal court. It was for the truth's sake, that I hesitated at no sacrifice it required from me; and it is for the truth that I lay the present narrative before the public; "falsehood is no longer a venial offence, it is a serious crime, the motto of the present age is liberty and truth." After the specimen we have given of our author's performances under this head, we think our readers will agree with us, that at any rate truth is *not* the motto of Dr. Achilli. For ourselves, we have read the book with some attention, and we doubt whether there is any one fact from beginning to end which is truly stated; in most cases, the falsehood is ludicrously palpable even to the most ordinary observation. And yet we see among the "opinions of the press" paraded in the advertisement of a second edition, that one journal has declared it to be "*an authority* on all that relates to the Inquisition;" another says that it is "worthy of our attention," and then adds (but with modest caution), "and we believe also, worthy of our trust;" whilst a third—and that too no mean hireling, whose praises are to be bought, but a really independent and on ordinary matters a very able authority, does not scruple to say, "this book contains internal evidence of truth." "Internal evidence of *truth*!" had he said "of falsehood," we could have understood him; but "truth" is really too ridiculous. A nice internal evidence of truth is that we have just pointed out. Here is another, taken from his account of a conversation, or rather a series of conversations, which he held with a Jesuit father at Tivoli, in the year 1833; and the reader must bear in mind that this Jesuit is represented as having just taken the solemn vows, and been admitted to the last profession. Achilli asks his friend, why the Jesuits are never raised to places of dignity or profit in the Church; to which the *wily* Jesuit is made to answer, "If any other person than yourself had put this question to me, I should have given him the answer which our institution puts into our mouths. A Jesuit is sworn to aspire to no ecclesiastical dignity, nor can he accept any, without a special dispensation from the Pope. But this reply will not be sufficient for you, to whom I have disclosed so many of our secrets. I tell you then—" But we are sure our readers will not care to hear the wretched mixture of nonsense and wickedness which is here made to follow from this extremely communicative member of the Society of Jesus. Suffice it to say, that this same individual confides to Dr. Achilli that the Jesuits are the authors of Puseyism in England, that they are exceedingly busy in stirring up strife among the Dissenters;

and, in short, that he reveals the whole secret history of their doings both in this country and elsewhere.

There is one especial characteristic, however, of this conversation with the Jesuit which is worth mentioning, more particularly since it is afterwards repeated in other conversations also, viz. the speaker is endowed with the gift of prophecy; and lest any of his predictions should be lost upon the reader, a note is always appended, calling his attention both to the prophecy and to its fulfilment; *e.g.* in p. 171, "This prophecy has come to pass;" in p. 172, "Here likewise the Jesuit has proved himself a true prophet;" in p. 178, "The Jesuit was again correct in his prediction." As to the subject-matter of these prophecies, they take a somewhat extended range, from the straight-cut coat and upright collar of the Puseyite parson, and the preference given by that eccentric section of the English Episcopalians to Popery rather than Dissent, up to the violent expulsion of the Jesuits and the flight of the Pope during the recent disturbances at Rome. Is any one disposed to doubt their authenticity? You have Dr. Achilli's word for it, who now, in the year 1851, has just published to the world the full and complete account of this conversation held in the autumn of the year 1833, *precisely* at the very moment, be it remembered, when the publication of the *Tracts for the Times* was begun in Oxford. Truly this wonderful Jesuit had the gift of second sight in no mean degree; for in describing the actual condition of English Episcopalians at that time (the autumn of 1833), he says: "The clergy of the Reformed Church of the present day, both ministers and *bishops* (!), have *for the most part* an idea that the Reformation has taken away much which might have been retained. . . . And thus by degrees in some churches *we see* images set up over the communion-table, which give it the appearance of an altar. And if an image is not allowed, at least a handsome cross may be painted and gilded, before which the minister as he passes may make his obeisance" (p. 172). We recommend Dr. Achilli to study the *variations* of Puseyism a little more closely, before he ventures to make them the subject of another imaginary conversation held some fifteen or twenty years back; especially let him thoroughly master its chronology, or at least let him submit the ms. of his conversations and prophecies, on all that concerns England, to some English friend who may correct such glaring errors as these.

One more *prophecy*, and we have done. It was in the year 1835 that a certain Roman priest, "a very respectable man named Father Parchetti," was conversing with our friend

on the subject of Papal Rome, which he very wisely observed would "never die by her own hand, and will make every possible struggle against any other that may be lifted up to give her her death-stroke." It scarcely required a prophet, even one of Achilli's manufacture, to tell us this. However, he goes on to say, that "Rome is committing the greatest blunders every day, and that the day will come when she will make a last and fatal one. Can you guess what it will be?" "Certainly not," is the modest and prudent answer of Achilli; "but I should like to hear it from you"—and so, we dare say, would our readers also. Here it is then, slightly abridged, as the limits of our space require; but nevertheless ushered in with all the solemnity so justly recorded in the original, and befitting the announcement of so great an event.

"Listen then, and remember it," said the oracle, "because I shall not live to see it, but you may. Mark what I foretell. The missionaries of the Propaganda will instigate Rome to commit some act of imprudence. What I foresee is this: the influence of Rome in the British Isles must produce its effect, which is that of converting the Protestants to our faith. If to the English and Irish missionaries which Rome has hitherto employed, those of Italy, and more especially the Jesuits, are united, proselytes cannot fail. In fact, they will be so numerous, and will excite so much interest, that Rome will be led to imagine that the time has arrived for her to take England by assault. Accordingly the Pope will create Bishops and Archbishops, declaring the Protestant Hierarchy completely null and abolished. England, not being prepared for this master-stroke of policy, will for the moment be too astonished to testify her sense of its audacity; but soon recollecting her former history, and conscious of her power, she will institute new laws to prevent usurpation, and she will drive away the aggressors, &c. England will do this the very day that Rome gives her sufficient provocation, and that day will be fatal in its results. This, my friend, is what I prophesy; when it comes to pass, recollect what my words have been."

And then our author has the face to append to this veracious history the following reflection:

"These sentiments, delivered by the good old man in the year 1835, now appear as if they had been dictated by inspiration" (p. 278).

Surely this will prove too strong a dose even for the credulity of Exeter Hall: if not,

"Danda est hellebori pars maxima;
Nescio an Anticyram ratio illis destinet omnem."

Enough has now been said to convey to our readers a tolerably correct idea of this last work of Dr. Achilli; they

will see that it is so clumsy and barefaced an attempt to impose upon the ignorant and the credulous, that perhaps it was scarcely necessary for us to take any notice of it at all. And indeed we should hardly have done so, had not Father Theiner's work come to hand, and by revealing to us the simple truth about *some* of Achilli's dealings with the Inquisition, excited in us a curiosity to see his own account, not only of those particular passages with which Father Theiner was concerned, but also of all the others.

Father Theiner is the individual whom Achilli is pleased to call "the Theologian of the Inquisition," "the papal Theologian," "the Theologian of the Romish Church," &c., as if he were some extraordinary public officer belonging to that establishment and occupying some distinguished position in it, whereas he was perfectly well aware that he had no connexion with it whatever. However, a theologian he undoubtedly is, and enjoys a very high reputation both for learning and piety, being one of those distinguished converts whom Germany has of late years given to the true fold. On the 8th of January in the present year, the Cardinal Vicar of Rome addressed to him the following note, which, as it was never intended to meet the public eye, will not be uninteresting, we think, to many of our readers:

"Very Reverend Father,—I have to propose to you to exercise an act of charity towards a poor miserable man, whom if God, by your means, should vouchsafe to recall to his fold, it will be much to the advantage of religion. The unhappy man I speak of is Achilli, whose lamentable history will not be unknown to you, and who is now a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo. Our Holy Father, in his great anxiety for his eternal salvation, has ordered me to appoint some learned and zealous ecclesiastic, who under the pretext of paying him a visit of charity in his prison, may introduce the topic of religion with him, and so make him conscious of his errors, and bring him back to God. I know of no one better suited to carry out this benevolent purpose of his Holiness than yourself, Reverend Father; I beg you therefore to undertake it, with the certainty that, whatever may be its success, you will at least be gaining merit in God's sight. Not doubting but that you will send me a reply in the affirmative, I remain, &c.
C. CARD. VICAR."

In obedience to this invitation, F. Theiner visited Achilli four separate times during the week from the 12th to the 19th of January; and unless the unhappy man was guilty of the most consummate hypocrisy during these interviews, which we will not believe, God's grace was not inactive in his heart, and had well nigh overcome his malice, when the unlooked-for opportunity of escape was offered him, and he was once

more launched on that active course of error and falsehood from which his imprisonment had for a while suspended him. Of course, Achilli himself has given us to understand concerning these interviews, that they were so many opportunities for him "to deliver his testimony" in the presence of the very enemy, and that he never failed to make the most of them as such. He even says that he used to observe to several of his friends who were with him in prison, "I am only afraid that, feeling how firm I am, Padre Theiner may discontinue his visits, and tell the Cardinals and the Pope that every attempt to bring me back to the Roman Church is useless" (p. 482). Whether he really *did* make this lying boast to his fellow-prisoners, we have no means of ascertaining; we believe that he did not: we *know* his account of what he said to F. Theiner to be false. He says, that "at the end of each visit he always requested him to report to the Cardinal Vicar every thing he had said, adding that every day he felt more and more firm and fixed in his purpose." On the contrary, *we* know that, whereas in the first visit he *did* attempt to argue and to maintain that St. Peter had never been made head of the Church, and even had never been in Rome at all; yet at the end of the third he implored his charitable visiter again and again to go as soon as he had left the prison and pray for him at the tomb of St. Peter, that tomb which he now affects to despise, and to have always despised. We know that even in the *second* visit matters had gone so far between the prisoner and his newly-found friend, that their discourse no longer consisted of theological arguments, but concerned the manner of his reconciliation with the Church; and that when this subject was under discussion, there was no disputing (as Achilli would fain have us believe) as to what was meant by this word 'Church,' but that the topic which was uppermost in his mind and upon his lips was this, "If I submit, what will become of me? What will the Pope and Cardinals do to me? How shall I live?" We know that to remove these fears, and give him courage and confidence as to his future fate, Father Theiner promised, on the word of a German, which he told him was as good as an oath, to share the last farthing of his own private means with him; and even, if need were, to appeal for help to the Prussian Embassy, rather than that he should suffer privation and want in consequence of his apostacy. (N.B. The reader must remember that at this time he was not only secularised, and so had no claim for support on the Dominican Order, but that he had also been suspended from the exercise of every sacerdotal function; he could not therefore say Mass, or earn a liveli-

hood in the capacity of chaplain any where. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.*) All this, I say, we know from the narrative of Father Theiner (pp. 248-258), which was published in Rome and Naples nearly a twelvemonth ago, long before Achilli had undertaken the office of making their conference public, which he professes to have done in the present volume with such "great satisfaction."

We need not institute any closer comparison between the two versions, for the substance of both has been already sufficiently declared; the occasion, however, of F. Theiner's publication is too interesting to be omitted, since it reveals to us so touching an example of that deep personal interest which our Holy Father never fails to manifest towards all who are in any way brought in contact with him. We make no apology, therefore, for inserting the following letter, written from Portici, where the Pope was then residing, by Monsignor Luca Pacifici, his Holiness's Secretary for Latin letters: it is addressed to Father Theiner, and bears the date of the 20th of February, 1850.

"Most Reverend and illustrious Sir, — The Holy Father, ever anxious to recal to the right path those who have strayed from it, though he has heard with much concern what has been the result of your zealous exertions in behalf of the unfortunate Achilli, nevertheless would fain make another effort through you to rescue that poor soul from the desperate enterprise in which it is embarked; and he is the more moved to do this, because, as I gather from your last letter, Achilli seemed to be very well disposed towards yourself personally, and to give you grounds of hope. His Holiness would desire therefore that you should write a letter to Achilli, wherever he may now be, full of words of affection, dictated by your own charity and learning, to the end that he may be roused out of that miserable lethargy in which he now lies.

"Should it please the merciful God to bless this further attempt, the good that may be expected to result from it will be a real consolation to his Holiness, and will redound to the glory of our holy Mother the Church. I have no misgivings as to your thorough and hearty accordance with what I have written; his Holiness gives you his blessing with all his heart; and I remain," &c. &c.

On the receipt of this letter, F. Theiner immediately proposed to himself to carry out an idea which he had already communicated to Achilli in one of his conferences, and indeed had partially adopted, viz. to compile a sort of Apology for the Catholic Church out of the concessions of its most determined adversaries, wisely judging that it was not possible to do justice to so large a subject as the defence of the Catholic faith within the limits of a single letter. The Pope, as soon

as he had heard of F. Theiner's proposition, not only sanctioned and encouraged it, but commanded him to put it into execution with all possible speed, and promised to undertake the expenses of publication, if they could not otherwise be provided for. Out of these circumstances grew the present work, in which, if there is not much room for the display of originality and talent, there is at least a necessity for great industry and research. It was not written as an exercise of the intellect, or for the display of learning, but solely as a labour of love for the conversion of a poor wandering sinner; and as such it deserves a high rank among the rapidly increasing volumes of popular Catholic controversial literature.

Its argument is something of this kind: Protestantism is no longer a new system, whose professions deserve to be examined upon their own merits, and to be compared with the testimony of the Bible and of the Church; it is now three centuries old, and during this period it has had plenty of time to come to maturity, and we see its fruits. We need not then, in order to ascertain its true character, enter into any minute examination of its creeds and principles, and definitions and articles of faith, as they appear on paper, but may take a shorter and surer way of dealing with it by looking at its results. And what are these? We do not ask what they are in the opinions of Catholics and of the enemies of the Reformation, but what are they even according to the confession of the most zealous and learned Protestants themselves? Starting from this principle, F. Theiner goes on to shew, from the writings of the most eminent German Protestants, that the Reformation has produced in that country an almost complete and avowed abandonment of Christianity itself, even in its vaguest and most general acceptation; and during this first part of his work, his line of argument is precisely that which was very ably followed in an article of the *Dublin Review* some four or five years ago, intituled "Developments of Protestantism."

But our author, not content with this merely destructive argument for the annihilation of Protestantism, proceeds in the second part to construct a positive and a very forcible argument in favour of the doctrines of Catholicism from the very same sources. He brings together a number of passages, selected from the writings of the most eminent German Protestants of the present century, in defence of various doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, against which their forefathers so vehemently protested. And certainly it is a strange and striking spectacle to see the descendants of Luther, and Calvin, and Melancthon, in the very country which was the

cradle of the Reformation, striving to stem the tide of public opinion in the course on which those men were the first to set it, and bearing most unequivocal testimony to those blessed truths which those men were the first to deny. There is scarcely a distinctive doctrine of the Catholic Church for which we do not find in these pages some warm and eloquent apology from the pen of one who was brought up to disbelieve it, perhaps even trained and educated expressly to resist and calumniate it. Here the insufficiency of holy Scripture, as the only rule of faith, is as loudly proclaimed as if the writer had been a Catholic and not a Protestant; and even the rejection of the (so-called) Apocryphal Books is made the subject of complaint, as an unwarranted innovation; the indiscriminate reading of the Bible is declared to be a serious evil, and the Bible Societies are condemned as eminently mischievous; the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist is justified as right and according to truth; the necessity for a visible centre of union to the Christian Church is inculcated, and the beneficial effects of the Papacy, both on the cause of European civilisation and of the Christian religion, frankly acknowledged; the sacrament of penance is restored to its proper place in the Christian system, and the necessity of auricular confession positively insisted on; invocation of the saints, and a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin, is recognised with approbation; so also are purgatory, and prayer for the dead; monasticism, and the whole discipline of the cloistered life, is praised with the utmost enthusiasm; and, finally, even the rites and ceremonies of Catholic worship are made the subject of frequent panegyric. Wonderful phenomenon! to see the whole fabric of Catholic discipline and doctrine built up by men whose very calling it would seem to have been to pull it down and destroy it. Yet it is a phenomenon which we have witnessed in our own country also, not only of late years in the writings of those Puseyites who have ultimately submitted to the Church, and so deprived their former testimony to its truth and sublimity of all that rhetorical power which belongs to the acknowledgment of an avowed enemy, but also in the writings of past generations who died, as they had lived, out of the true fold. In fact, many an Anglican has, by God's grace, been moved to become a Catholic through an attentive consideration of this phenomenon; he studies the Anglican divines, and he finds that in becoming a Catholic he is but "embracing that creed which alone is the scope to which they converge in their separate teaching; the creed which upholds the divinity of tradition with Laud, consent of Fathers with Beveridge, a visible Church with

Bramhall, a tribunal of dogmatic decisions with Bull, the authority of the Pope with Thorndike, penance with Taylor, prayers for the dead with Ussher, celibacy, asceticism, ecclesiastical discipline with Bingham.* It is curious, therefore,—and to those who are separated from us it ought to be very instructive,—to observe how the same phenomena are every where produced in Protestantism, even under the most different external and political circumstances,—first, divisions and subdivisions within itself, tending with irresistible force to decay and utter dissolution; and then yearnings, more or less loudly expressed, but always most keenly felt by the wisest and best of its victims, towards a return to the ancient truth.

We have no space to make extracts, and indeed what we see before our eyes renders such a task altogether unnecessary; the religious history of our own country during the last twenty years is as apt an illustration as can be desired of this second part of F. Theiner's work; in fact, the English theological literature of that period might be made to supply a precise parallel to what he has here collected from the theological literature of Germany; but such a collection would be more curious perhaps than useful, excepting for the particular purpose for which it has been here undertaken, viz. to prevent a people who are happily as yet strangers to Protestantism from ever entering upon that road, in which all travellers seem, sooner or later, to desire nothing so much as to retrace their steps. Should any of our readers, however, have any desire to pursue the investigation of this subject more closely, it may be worth while to mention that, besides the volume now before us, it is also very fully treated of in a German work published in 1837 by Dr. Höninghaus, and translated into French in 1845. The title of the French translation is, *La réforme contre la réforme, ou retour à l'unité catholique par la voie du Protestantisme*, and it was published with an introduction by M. Audin.

The third part of Father Theiner's work is principally taken up with a review of the present actual condition of public opinion on religious matters generally, of all parties external to the Catholic Church, in Germany; and it contains some very interesting details on the religious condition of the Jews in that country. The spirit of Rationalism seems to have made the same desolating inroad on the religious belief of the Jews, as it has on that of the Protestants; "there is now no Hebrew community, or synagogue, however small," says one of themselves (Dr. Creizenach, quoted by F. Theiner, p. 219), "which is not divided into two sections, the orthodox,

* Loss and Gain, p. 325.

and the reformers, those who reverence the Talmud and those who reject it; those who observe all the ritual laws most strictly, and those who call themselves enlightened and liberal men, and who therefore reject nearly all the ancient legal and religious ceremonies, on the plea that they were merely accidental to the system, not essential, and quite out of keeping with the spirit of the age." Even the belief in a future Messiah has given way before this "liberal and enlightened" spirit; or rather it has been designedly discouraged, and as far as possible eradicated out of the minds of the poorer part of the population, because it was found to expose them too much to the artifices of every designing impostor who chose to assume that character. Modern Judaism, then, is as unlike the Judaism of Moses and Aaron, and David and the Prophets, as the Christianity of Protestantism is unlike the Christianity of St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory. Both the one and the other have drifted away from their ancient moorings, and are now at the mercy of every wind and wave which they may chance to come across on that wild waste of waters on which they have entered. And from this deadly infection of Rationalism, which is spreading so rapidly on every side, individuals are being rescued, both from among Protestants and from among Jews, here one and there another, and being gathered into the one true fold, *extra quam nulla salus*. In Germany as in England, "Rome and unbelief are the two vortices round which, and into which, all other modes of opinion are visibly edging, in more or less quickening circles;" and we quite agree with Father Theiner in drawing from this fact a most encouraging omen as to the rich harvest of souls which we may expect to see gathered into the Church, even during the present generation.

In conclusion, Father Theiner makes a powerful appeal to the Italians, more especially the Romans, to stand firm in the faith in which they have been brought up, and to resist the impious and sacrilegious attempts which are being made by a few miserable apostates, traitors alike to their country and to their faith, to introduce the hateful poison of Protestantism,—that is, in truth, of infidelity and atheism,—into that favoured peninsula; he reminds them of the obligations which they owe to those who have occupied the See of Peter, and not least to their present sovereign, Pius IX., some of whose most striking and valuable allocutions and encyclical letters he has added in an Appendix; and then he gives us that history of his conferences with Achilli of which we have already spoken, and which were the occasion, as we have seen, of the

whole work being written at all. That it should effect the end for which its amiable author was persuaded to undertake it, is more than we can dare hope for. Achilli surrounded with his wife and friends and all the comforts of an English home, paraded about on the platform, fêted at Exeter Hall and Evangelical tea-meetings, is a very different individual from Achilli left to his own reflections in the solitude of a Roman prison; it is not his understanding that needs enlightenment, but his will and affections that require correction; his attachment to Protestantism springs from the same source, and deserves the same treatment, as Aristotle would award to those children who cannot see that it is their duty to obey their parents; οὐ λόγου δεονται, ἀλλὰ κολασεως, says the Stagyrte; and we are very much of his opinion. At the same time, we would not have it supposed that we mean to characterise F. Theiner's work as useless on this account, and merely so much lost labour. Far from it; the deceived are always more numerous than the deceivers, and deserve much more consideration; and should there be any, either in Rome or in any other part of Italy, who were really led astray in matters of faith by means of Dr. Achilli and his friends (we believe that religion was the last subject about which Achilli himself ever troubled those who frequented him, whether *in* prison or out of it), this book may by God's grace be expected to do good service in the way of opening their eyes to the folly of which they have been guilty; we say the *folly*, because (as our readers will have seen from the sketch which we have given of the general contents of the work) this is the point which F. Theiner's demonstrations go to prove, the folly of Italians taking up Protestantism at a time when everywhere else it has been tried and failed, and is now being universally abandoned, some exchanging it for the ancient and Catholic faith, others for pantheism and infidelity. "Luther built up a Church," said one of his disciples more than thirty years ago, at the *tercentenary* celebration of that heretic's memory, "and we are come together to-day to bless and to praise God for it; but behold, at the very moment that we are doing so, already it has ceased to exist" (Reinhard apud Theiner, p. 80). If this confession was necessary thirty years since, what shall we say now? Certainly the last thirty years have witnessed, in this country at least, a more rapid progress in the decay of Protestantism than twice that number of years in any earlier period of its existence; and its recent violent but futile attempts to withstand the aggression of its ancient enemy, are already producing results that must inevitably hasten its dissolution.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE extreme depression in the bookselling trade, consequent on the Exhibition in Hyde Park, is shared by the Catholic publishers, who suffer at the same time from the present exasperation of the Protestant public against every thing that is called Catholic. We have but few novelties, therefore, to recommend this month.

Dr. Rock has brought out a new edition of his *Hierurgia* (Dolman) in a single volume, with a few additions. Considering the apathy of so many Catholics towards Catholic literature, it is satisfactory to see a book of so much learning and merit reaching a new edition. The more learned reader need not be informed that the *Hierurgia* is indispensable to the English Catholic library.

Dr. Crookall, to whose exertions is due the present admirable ecclesiastical chanting at St. Edmund's College, has added two more numbers to his series of *Sacred Songs, &c.* (Burns and Lambert): containing *Lauda Jerusalem*, a pleasing, simple, and lively composition for four voices; Zingarelli's *O sacrum Convivium*, a somewhat flimsy production, for three voices; and a motett by the editor, *Iustorum animæ*, quite as easy as Zingarelli's commonplaces, and a vast deal better as a composition.

The *Clifton Tracts*, as far as they have now appeared, have been issued in a volume. This is a good thought of the editors, as it puts them in a much more *lendable* shape.

If new books are less multitudinous than usual, the catalogue of older ones is innumerable, as we are reminded by the sight of another of Mr. Stewart's Catalogues, just out. Here is one bookseller offering above 2000 different works on *Ecclesiastical and Monastic History and Antiquities* (chiefly Catholic) as a mere portion of his collection. Few booksellers, it is true, can compete with Mr. Stewart in his own peculiar line.

We observe with great pleasure that M. de Rossi has read before the Archæological Academy in Rome a very brief programme of his long-promised work on the *Ancient Christian Inscriptions* of that city. It appears that his collection, confined to the first six centuries as to time, and to the metropolis of Christendom as to place, will comprise upwards of 8000 inscriptions; and that of these more than half have been copied by himself from the original monuments. These 8000 inscriptions will be distributed in three classes: the first, of all those which throw any light upon the dogmas, discipline, or rites and ceremonies of the Church in those early days; the second, of those which are of any value as elucidating points of philology, geography, civil and domestic manners, and the like; and the rest will be arranged chronologically in the third class. The

arrangement within the first and second classes will be not merely chronological, but also of such a nature as that the inscriptions shall mutually explain one another by the juxtaposition of all that belong to kindred subjects.

This programme was received by the Pontifical Academy with the warmest applause; and the appearance of the first portion of the work is looked for with great eagerness by all the *savans* assembled in Rome. It will be an invaluable work both to the student of profane and of Christian archæology.

Correspondence.

ON THE DISPOSAL OF THE SECOND ABLUTION IN CASE OF DUPLICATION.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Your correspondent “S.” will find the subject of his query discussed at some length in Mr. Hughes’s book on the Ceremonies of Low Mass, p. 90 of the edition of 1846.

In the first case proposed, namely, that of the second Mass being said in the same church, there can be no doubt that the rules laid down for the Masses on Christmas-day should be followed. At the first Mass, the chalice should not be purified (*S. R. C.* 16 Sept. 1702, n. 3486; *Gardellini*, 16 Sept. 1815, n. 4365), but should be covered with the paten and pall, and left upon the corporal (*Merati*, part iv. tit. 3, n. 7; *Janssens*, part iii. tit. 9, n. 17; *Romsée*, tom. iii. art. 2, n. 13). The purificator should not be used to wipe the chalice or the celebrant’s mouth, and it should not be placed upon the chalice (*Directorium ad usum Eccl. Mechliniensis pro Die Nat. Dni.*). The celebrant should then wash his fingers at the Epistle corner *in aliquo vase mundo*, both wine and water being poured over them for that purpose as usual (*Merati*, *ibid.*; *Directorium Mechl.* *ibid.*). Having wiped his fingers with the purificator, he should place the above-mentioned vessel at the back part of the altar, cover it with a pall, and place the purificator near to it (*Merati*, *ibid.*; *Romsée*, *ibid.*). He should then cover the chalice with the veil. If it be necessary to remove the chalice from the altar to the sacristy before the second Mass, it should always be placed upon a corporal or pall (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 8 and 14). It appears from the decree 16th September, 1815, that it may be placed within the tabernacle. At the second Mass, the celebrant should not wipe the chalice with the purificator at the offertory, and he should not remove it from the corporal (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 9 and 14; *Romsée*, *ibid.*). After the communion of the second Mass, the celebrant, having received the ordinary purification, should pour the ablution of the first Mass from the aforesaid vessel into the chalice, receive it, then wash his fingers over the chalice as usual, and afterwards wipe both the chalice and the vessel with the purificator (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 10).

In the second case, namely, when the second Mass is said in another church, all should be done as above, except that the veil of the chalice should be fastened securely about it in the same way as done on Maundy

Thursday (*S. R. C.* 16th September, 1815, n. 4365); and this same chalice should be taken and used for the second Mass. The words of the above decree are: "Emi Domini Cardinales S. Rit. Congregationi præpositi reprobarunt usum duorum calicum tamquam in Ecclesia novum, et censuerunt unum dumtaxat esse adhibendum ut in more est apud Missionarias in locis præsertim infidelium." This decree makes no mention of what is to be done with the ablution of the fingers in this second case. Mr. Hughes (*Cerem. of Low Mass*, p. 93) inclines to the opinion that it should be poured into the sacrarium. The *Encyclopédie* of the Abbé Migne, tom. xv. art. "Binage," observes that "l'ablution des doigts présente moins de difficulté puisqu'on peut la mettre dans la piscine." Bauldry (part iv. cap. 2, n. 24) and the *Manuel des Cérémonies Rom.* (tom. ii. part 6, art. 3, n. 5,) direct that the ablutions of the first and second Mass of Christmas-day be poured into the sacrarium, provided the priest be prevented from receiving them at the third Mass. There are, however, some who approve of the practice of carrying the ablutions to the second Mass. L.

August 6th, 1851.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—With regard to the disposal of the second ablution in the case of duplicating, I beg to submit whether, as the practice of duplicating is wholly exceptional, and as the Church has consequently made no provision for it, we ought not to form our rule in the matter upon that which is given for the three Masses on Christmas-day? It is there prescribed (vid. *Ordo*) that the second ablution shall be made with *wine and water*, as usual. And I do not see what inconvenience follows from purifying the fingers with wine and water, not, however, over the chalice, but in a separate vessel (*in aliquo vase mundo*—vid. *Ordo*), and receiving this ablution, as on Christmas-day, with that of the last Mass. I am aware, however, that there is authority in practice for the plan of your correspondent, viz. the purification of the fingers in water alone, and making it in the vessel used at communions out of Mass.

While, however, I submit these observations, I beg to express a strong opinion that such questions are more appropriately made the subject of a reference to authority, or of consultation at clerical conferences, than of discussion in a periodical which has a wide circulation among Protestants as well as Catholics.

I am, sir, your faithful servant,

F.

PATRON AND TITULAR SAINTS.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—I avail myself with pleasure of your Portfolio, that I may ask whether I am right in the ideas that I have formed regarding Patron and Titular Saints. I assert my positions as if they were certain, simply for convenience' sake. I speak entirely under correction; and my object in writing is, that I may have my ideas either confirmed or disproved.

First, then, I believe the word "Titular" or *Titulus* belongs solely to what is commonly called the "Patron" of a church. It is a useful word, as including mysteries, such as the Transfiguration or the Immaculate Conception, which are the titles of some churches. The term "Patron" is properly applied to the *Santo avvocato* of places rather than

churches. Thus a place may be under the invocation of some one patron, and in it there may be several churches with various titles. The title of a church is a feast of the rite of double of the first class with an octave, having also a commemoration in the suffrages, in its due place, to the clergy attached to that particular church, and to them only. The Bishop of the diocese has the power of assigning a title to a church, even to one that is not consecrated; and the clergy are bound in such a case by the Bishop's act. But, on the other hand, no one but the Pope can assign a patron to a particular locality, unless the Saint has been *elected* patron, according to the regulations of Pope Urban VIII., given, I believe, in some editions of the Breviary. In this latter case, besides the rite *dupl. 1 cl. cum Oct.*, and the commemoration in the suffrages, the feast becomes a day of obligation in the locality, and its vigil a fast-day. Such would also be the consequence of the Pope's granting a local patron, unless an exception to this rule should be expressly mentioned in the rescript. Further, there can be one patron of a nation, another of a province, another of a diocese, and another of a town; all of which will have to be observed with the same honours by all living within the particular localities. When more patrons than one have thus to be kept, they take their place in the suffrages according to their rank; and when of equal rank, the particular is preferred to the more general. Thus a Martyr precedes a Confessor, a Bishop precedes one who was not a Bishop; and when of equal rank, the titular of the church precedes the patron of the diocese, and the diocese again is preferred to the province or nation. And to conclude this general view of the subject, in the *A cunctis* the titular of the church in which the Mass is said is alone mentioned, and not any other patron whatever.

Now, to look to our own case in England, what patrons have we? It is said that Pope Benedict XIV. made St. George patron of the *nation*, and I have heard 1746 given as the date of the brief; but I am unable to find it in that great Pope's Bullarium. Can any of your readers direct me to a copy of it? However, the *fact* seems undeniable that St. George is patron of all England, and the *law* equally clear that all England is bound to honour him with all the rights of a patron; and he is not interfered with, nor his rights diminished, by any more local or particular patronage. With regard to patrons of dioceses, I presume that the establishment of the Hierarchy has annulled all previous patronages conceded. We have, then, to look only to those granted since our present organisation. The archdiocese and the diocese of Southwark are under the patronage of Our Lady in her Immaculate Conception; the diocese of Northampton is under St. Thomas of Canterbury: I am not aware of any other. In the former case, I should be glad to ask how the patron is to be commemorated in the suffrages; whether *Sancta Maria* is sufficient, or whether it has to come from the new office of the Immaculate Conception. In the case of Northampton, St. Thomas precedes St. George, the antiphons and verses being taken according to the rule given by the S. R. C.

I wish to ask in conclusion, by what right the compiler of the *Ordo* calls St. Thomas *Cleri Sæc. Angliæ Protect.* What Pope made him so? And what consequences does it entail? And finally, whether the patrons of a nation and of a diocese are to be honoured as such by the regulars therein, as well by those who live in community as by those who have cure of souls? Are there any decrees on the subject?

Yours, &c.

J. M.

P.S. The *Credo* ought to be said on the secondary feasts of patrons and titulars, as on their translations, &c.

In answer to the queries of "John Morris" in our July number the pastor of one of the chief cathedral parishes in the United States writes as follows:

I am pleased to see a new leaf opened in the *Rambler*, to be appropriated to the proposing and answering of questions by the clergy. If I thought it were not too late, I would answer the questions thus;—though American notions about theology might not have much weight.

1st. These questions are too indefinite.

2d. By no right, unless this privilege has been granted by Rome. Those who say the office on that day do not satisfy the obligation.

3d. The same as is used when persons who are confined by sickness receive communion in their houses.

4th. It has no authority, except it has derived some special privilege from Rome, as is the case with the ritual used in America.

5th. It is the custom for the servers to kneel in the Propaganda.

6th. The countersignature and seal are not sufficient.

7th. Yes. The priest says the whole of both, and this is sufficient.

At some future time, it is not unlikely that some questions for solution will be sent from this side of the Atlantic.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Will you be so good as to insert the following questions in the Priest's Portfolio in your next Number?

1. Can we ask the souls in Purgatory to pray for us?

2. Can Indulgences obtained by a person for the dead be placed in the hands of our Blessed Lady, begging of her to apply them to whom she will?

Yours faithfully,

F. M. A.

Ecclesiastical Register.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ASSUMPTION ACT: ITS AUTHORS.

THIS bill received the royal assent on the 1st August. It is the joint production of her Majesty's Ministers, Mr. Walpole, Sir Frederic Thesiger, and Mr. Keogh. The part which belongs to her Majesty's Ministers is printed in Roman letter, the rest is in Italic.

Whereas divers of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects have assumed to themselves the titles of Archbishops and Bishops of a pretended province, and of pretended sees or dioceses, within the United Kingdom, under colour of an alleged authority given to them for that purpose *by certain Briefs, Rescripts, or Letters Apostolical from the See of Rome, and particularly—*[Sir F. Thesiger's]*—by a certain Brief, Rescript, or Letter Apostolical purporting to have been given at Rome on the 29th September, 1850; and whereas, by the act of the tenth year of King George the Fourth, chapter seven, after reciting that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, and likewise the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, were by the respective acts of Union of England and Scotland, and of Great Britain and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably, and that the right and title of Archbishops to their respective provinces, of Bishops to their sees, and of Deans to their*